

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXIII.

BALTIMORE, DECEMBER, 1908.

No. 8.

CONCERNING THE FOUR DAUGHTERS OF GOD.

In Miss Traver's valuable study, *The Four Daughters of God* (*Bryn Mawr College Monographs*), a position of importance among the medieval churchmen and poets who treated the allegory suggested by the Psalmist, "Misericordia et Veritas obviaverunt sibi; Justitia et Pax osculatæ sunt," is assigned to Bishop Grosseteste. "In his theological poem, the *Chateau d'Amour*, the allegory from Bernard's sermon appears in a novel setting; for by shifting the scene from a heavenly to an earthly court, he has transformed it to a feudal romance" (p. 29). The originality of Grosseteste in this respect I question; for from my own studies in the allegory, though far less exhaustive than Miss Traver's, I can point to a similar modification of the story, which must have antedated the bishop's poem, and which must have been of considerable importance.

A sermon attributed to Bede in the older editions of his works,¹ tells of a "Father of a family, a mighty King," who had a Son equal to him in power, and four daughters, Mercy, Truth, Justice, and Peace. He had also a favored servant. Thus far the sermon and poem agree. But more explicitly than Grosseteste, the preacher, identifying the servant with Adam, explains the reason for the one restriction placed upon this servant, and his attempted shifting of responsibility upon "the woman" when called to account for disobedience. The preacher describes, too, in full the duties of the four "tortores" to whom the offender is delivered: the first (I follow the order of the text), to imprison him; the second, to behead him; the third, to strangle him; the fourth, to torture him. These men are later

named: Prison of Exile, Worldly Misery, Death, and the Worm. Then the intercession of Mercy and the ensuing controversy are given as in the *Chateau d'Amour*, except that the preacher, explaining why Peace can not dwell where there is discord, does not bring the fourth daughter into the debate till the Son has already effected a reconciliation. In other respects the sermon and the poem are essentially the same.

This sermon, like others formerly attributed to Bede, was rejected by Giles. It may, though, be the rude draft of a sermon by Bede which some monk cared to preserve. At all events, it was probably written at a date sufficiently early to give cause for the common tradition as to its authorship. May it not, then, deserve some of the credit which Miss Traver assigns the *Chateau d'Amour* for first introducing important modifications in the allegory? *Les Quatre Sereurs*, I should judge from her outline, follows the sermon in describing the effort of the guilty servant to evade punishment, in treating explicitly the different punishments of the four jailers, and in rehearsing the progress of the debate. The part that Peace plays in *Les Quatre Sereurs* is not made plain in the outline; but I am inclined to believe that the poem was derived from the sermon, or some related version of the allegory—at least not exclusively from the *Chateau d'Amour*.

To the chapter of the monograph on the "Processus Belial" I may add a little by calling attention to a sermon preached "ad populum" in the twelfth century by Peter of Blois.² Its subject is the judgment of a sinner. Before God, the judge, Satan brings his accusations against the prisoner, Man, charging him with infidelity to the sacraments, treason, and theft. Conscience, too, in spite of the prisoner's questioning the legality of a woman's testimony,

¹ *Opera Bedæ Venerabilis*, 8 vols. Basil. 1563. Vol. 7, c. 511-513.

² Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, Vol. 207, c. 750-775.

supports the charges, reminding Man that through his sin she has lost her original purity. Man, in fact, is hard pressed by his accusers, until the three daughters of the judge, Faith, Hope, and Charity, come to his aid. They, however, meet the wily arguments of Satan, and, after Faith has taught the accused the words of salvation, *Credo, Credo*, they lead him before the throne, where he implores and receives forgiveness.

From the contents of this interesting sermon, which may be entitled *The Three Daughters of God*, it is plain that it could not have been the source of those later texts discussed in the monograph. But as an early instance of the participation of the Devil in this type of theological allegory, the sermon may not be here irrelevant.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

Yale University.

A LETTER FROM MEDINILLA TO LOPE DE VEGA.

Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla was born at Toledo in the year 1585. His real name was Baltasar Eloy de Medinilla, and with this name he signed a sonnet which he contributed to a poetical contest, held at Toledo in 1605, in honor of the birth of Philip IV.¹ He later adopted the more poetic name, Elisio.

Medinilla is of particular interest to us, as having been one of Lope de Vega's most devoted friends. We cannot say just when this friendship began, but in 1608, Lope left to Medinilla the task of correcting the proof of his epic poem, *Jerusalén Conquistada*.² Lope's pastoral romance, *Los Pastores de Belén*, contains laudatory verses by Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla, and Barrera noted that Lope introduced his friend into the story under the name of Elisio.³ This intimacy continued, and when

Lope's beloved son Carlos Felix died in 1612, Medinilla wrote a letter of condolence to the grief-stricken father, expressing his affection for him, and urging him to bear with patience his great sorrow. This letter is included in a manuscript collection of the works of Medinilla preserved in the Biblioteca Nacional of Madrid.⁴

In 1617, Medinilla's first work appeared with the title: *Limpia Concepcion de la Virgen señora nuestra. Por Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla*.⁵ The poem is preceded by a number of laudatory verses, and Lope de Vega gives it his unqualified praise, saying:

Letor, no ay sílaba aquí
Que de oro puro no sea.

We learn in the prologue that Medinilla had been working on the poem for seven years, and that for two years, Lope had tried to persuade him to publish it, but the author had hesitated, fearing to incur the censure of the critics.

This poem, in praise of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, and inspired by the writings of San Ildefonso, aroused the hostility of certain members of the Dominican Order. In a letter to the Archbishop of Seville, Medinilla relates how a certain Dominican, named Jacinto de Colmenares, had preached against the doctrines contained in his poem, and fearing the enmity of that Order, he wished to submit the case to the higher ecclesiastical authorities.⁶

His letter to Colmenares is also found in this manuscript collection.⁷ He urged that

⁴ MS. 4266, fol. 84b-88b. This manuscript was described by Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca*, Vol. III, col. 698.

⁵ Madrid, Viuda de Alonso Martín, 1617. Nicolás Antonio, *Bibliotheca Nova*, Vol. I, p. 182, mentions an edition of this work, published by Alonso Martínez, in 1618. Salva, *Catálogo*, Vol. I, p. 218, believed that Nicolás Antonio had mistaken the date, as well as the name of the printer, for he knew of no other edition than that of Madrid, 1617. However, there is a copy of an edition of 1618, printed by Viuda de Alonso Martín, in the Biblioteca Nacional.

⁶ MS. 4266, fol. 84-84b, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid.

⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 79-83b.

¹ *Relacion de las fiestas*, etc. Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca*, Vol. I, col. 753.

² Barrera, *Nueva biografía de Lope de Vega*, p. 148.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

courtesy should be especially observed in the pulpit, and that if his poem contained doctrines which were not recognized by the Church, his critic should have admonished him in a kindly way. He had diligently inquired as to the motive for the attack against him, and had learned that his sole fault consisted in having defended the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, and he gloried in the name of ignoramus which he had received in the defense of Our Lady.

This poem is the only work of Medinilla which was published. He also wrote a number of *versos á lo divino*, and a *Descripcion de Buena Vista*, in forty stanzas, dedicated to the Archbishop of Toledo, Sr. D. Bernardo de Rojas. This is accompanied by a commentary, the work of the Archbishop's nephew, D. Francisco de Rojas y Guzman, Conde de Mora.⁸

Medinilla was assassinated about the year 1620,⁹ and Lope de Vega mourned the sudden death of his friend in tender verses:

Lloraré, cantaré tu fin violento,
Y con el canto moveré llorando,
A mayor compasion y sentimiento.¹⁰

It was believed by some historians of Spanish literature that the dramatist Moreto took part in the assassination of Medinilla, but the true facts of the case are contained in a letter of Sr. D. Joaquín Manuel de Alba to Sr. D. Luis Fernández-Guerra y Orbe.¹¹ Here we learn that in 1620, Doña Gracia de Rentería y Medinilla and Doña Estefanía Suárez de Medinilla, sisters of Baltasar Elisio, and nuns in the convent of Santa Ursula of Toledo, took action against Don Jerónimo de Andrade y Rivadeneyra, for the murder of their brother. The case lasted for nine years, when the sisters agreed to drop the prosecution, provided that the murderer pay a certain sum of money, and

should not enter Toledo within four years, without their consent.

Two references to Medinilla's death by Antonio López de Vega, in his *Lírica Poesia*, Madrid, 1620, may prove that the former met his death about a year earlier than has been generally supposed. The *Privilegio* for this volume was signed March 19, 1619, and the *Tasa* was signed November 23, 1620. On fol. 27, we find a sonnet on the death of Medinilla:

"En digno sentimiento de la infelice muerte de Baltasar Elisio de Medinilla, cultissimo ingenio Toledano, honra de su patria, lustre de las buenas letras, robado violenta, i intempestivamente á los ojos de sus amigos, mas vivo, i presente siempre en el dolor de sus memorias.

"Cayó en Elisio (o hado riguroso!)
Cisne al Tajo, honra á Apolo, gloria á España.
I usurpa á todos la violenta saña,
Dulce canto, alta lira, hijo glorioso." etc.

This is followed by another sonnet, *Epitáfio sobre la sepultura del mismo*, which begins:

"Yaze aquí Elisio, Elisio, o peregrino,
Cuya armónica ciencia, i docto canto
Respetáran los Reynos del espanto,
I sacrilego más fué el hierro indino."

Judging from the fact that Medinilla's death is mentioned in a book, the *Privilegio* of which was signed in March, 1619, we might infer that he was already dead at that time. However, it is possible that these two sonnets were added after the signing of the first *Privilegio*.

It will be remembered that Lope de Vega dedicated to Medinilla his comedia *Santiago el Verde*, which was published in the *Trezena Parte de las comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*, Madrid, 1620. The fact that the *Aprobacion* for this volume was signed September 18, 1619, might prove that Medinilla's death occurred after that date. However, it may be that this volume of comedias was ready for the press in the early part of the year 1619, and that the *Aprobacion* was not granted until September of that year.

Since Medinilla's letter to Lope on the death of his son Carlos Felix is of some interest for Lope's biography, it is presented herewith,

⁸Gallardo, *Ensayo de una biblioteca*, Vol. III, col. 691-695.

⁹This is the date given by Barrera, *Nueva biografía de Lope de Vega*, p. 148.

¹⁰*La Filomena*, Madrid, 1621. See *Biblioteca de autores españoles*, Vol. 38, p. 366.

¹¹*Ibid.*, Vol. 39, p. xvii.

also a poem in *décimas*, by Medinilla.¹² I have kept the original spelling, but have changed the punctuation where I thought it necessary.

*A Lope de Vega Carpio en la muerte de Carlos
Felix su hijo, consolacion.*¹³

Despues que supe por carta vuestra, la ruina domestica (tal juzgo para vuestra alma en el dolor, la muerte de ese Angel), era oficio mio procurar remitir vuestra pena con algun consuelo, que con estudio he dilatado, porque antes aplicára á vuestro sentimiento intempestiuo remedio, ia porque la herida era tierna, que estocada peligrosa, ia porque ninguna verdad podré colegir en esta consolacion, que no la ubiesedes primero meditado. Conozco el afecto de los padres, aunque no lo soi. Conozco vuestra constancia, que no puede faltarles, auiedo mezclado la piedad con la erudicion, porque aquella no consiente que no querais lo que Dios quiere, y ésta enseña á tolerar lo que solo á nosotros sucede, mas lo que no se puede remediar con lagrimas. No espereis pues, á que el tiempo disminuia vuestro dolor, porque es medio de ingenios plebeios, ni quiteis gloria á la razon, que mejor es dejar al dolor antes que os deje; i de los sabios es, preuenir al tiempo, i ocurrir á la pena que nace, porque no sentir los males, no es de hombres, como ni de varones no sufrillos. Aunque la que haureis recibido colijo de la mia, y así pareceria inhumano, si impidiese llorar á un padre, quien siendo extraño no basta á detener el llanto. Pero conviene la integridad á un hombre como vos, porque ia que no podies olvidar el dolor, (¿quién niega que es justo?) le reprimais, i limiteis, que con él quiero combatir en vos mismo, lastimado en ver que en lugar dél que perdistes, tengais al dolor por hijo, porque no os naturaliceis en él de manera que venga á ser despues, más por costumbre que por deseo (iam morem fecerat usus), i es bien hacello en el Oriente del mal, porque más violentamente se ha de pelear contra lo antiguo i arraigado. ¿Quién, decid, inora auer nacido prestado al mundo? i así el que llora la muerte agena, ¿qué otra cosa siente sino ser mortal? O ¿porque más llora aquella que el nacimiento, siendo ambas cosas naturales, una principio, y otra fin de la vida? Los autores de los leies incluieron en breue termino el tiempo de llorar los difuntos, viendo que ninguno

dejaua de pasar por la de Naturaleça, ó porque no siendo injuria de la fortuna, basta poco dolor; ó porque es inútil á quien le padece, i graue á los que lo miran; i con raçon, porque más facilmente os lleuará á vuestro hijo, que os le traerá; el qual, si os atormenta, no le aprouecha, i así, es justo olvidalle al principio; porque si la raçon no pone fin al llanto, no lo hará la fortuna, que antes nos faltarán lagrimas que causas dellas, que por esto, nace-mos llorando, i lo mismo seguimos, i juzgo auerse de moderar, lo que se ha de sufrir muchas veces; i mirando quanto nos resta de tristeza, debemos, si no acaballas, suspendellas. No pienso acumular ejemplos, que dellos sobran libros. Solo sirua aquí el de Dauíd, que en tanto que tuuo esperanza de la vida de su hijo, mostraua sentimiento, mas despues de perdida, ia muerto, cesó en él, sabiendo que el llanto no auía de boluersele, i que presto auía de seguirle. ¿Quién ai tan loco, que procure mouer con ruegos á quien sabe que no se ha de ablandar? Las fieras se amansan con arte, quíbrase el diamante, rómpese el marmol; pero no ai con que enternecer la muerte, que uniuersalmente coje el fruto de todos, i por esta causa, mejor se ha de sufrir que otros males, ó por ineuitable, ó por comun, ó porque no viene segunda vez como ellos; i si los difuntos no bueluen con los sentimientos, si la suerte inmoble no se muda con miserias, i la muerte guarda lo que lleuó, cese el dolor que perece, que en faltarse, ve que no es su virtud natural, como la del fuego que lo consume todo, pues de diversas maneras sienten muchos sus males, i el tiempo quiebra las fuerças á la pena mayor, aunque se resista á los remedios. De donde colijo io, ser inútil, pues ó no quiere, ó no le entiende vuestro hijo; que si le siente, es ingrato, i si no superfluo, que el querrá que le deseeis, mas no que os atormenteis por su memoria; i si esto pretende, es indigno de vuestro amor; si no, vano vuestro sentimiento, porque el difunto tiene sentido, ó no; si no, carece de los males, i es furor dolerse por quien no se duele: si le tiene, goça del cielo, como es cierto; pues, ¿para qué será bueno consumirse por quien es bien auenturado?; que llorar á aquel, es enbidia, i á éste, locura; i considerados los daños, ó vicios á que se inclina nuestra edad, i quanto es ligera, antes se han de dar gracias al que muere, que lloralle. Euripides llama dia á nuestra vida, Demetrio Falereo corrigiendole, punto de tiempo, de cuiu breuedad ai un discurso en Seneca. Quan calamitosa sea, demuestran los Poetas en sus epítetos, nombrando míseros, tristes, i enfermos á los mortales, porque la primera parte de la vida, que

¹² Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, MS. 3922, fol. 41-42b.

¹³ Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, MS. 4266, fol. 84b-88b.

es la mejor, se inora; la media se ocupa en cuidados i negocios, i la ultima agrauan la enfermedad i vejez. Pero direis, murió vuestro hijo, sin tiempo, niño hermoso, i digno de larga vida. Respondo os, que qualquiera dia puede ser el postrero, pues unos sin ser aun hombres mueren en las oscuras patrias de los vientres, otros de diversas edades, i quan pocos tocan al umbral de la vejez, como dijo Homero; i no auiedo destinado tiempo á la vida, todos son legítimos á la muerte, porque no conviene medir el espacio del viuir con los solsticios, que la edad se ha de juzgar por las obras buenas, de suerte que aquel se dirá auer viuido mucho, no el que (con Homero) oprimió la tierra largos años, sino el que acabada bien la fábula de su vida, dejó de sí honesta memoria; i debe consolaros, que os dió presto el dolor, porque viuendo, auíais de verle morir poco á poco, pues el primero paso de la vida entre los suios le contó la muerte, como vos decís en un soneto; i el aumento de los dias, si bien se juzga, es daño, porque se acerca al fin, que diuidimos con la muerte el dia que vivimos. Por ventura. ¿quejareis os de auer tenido hijo, que le dese- aríais tener después de largo tiempo? Él cierto murió bien, pues fué quando empecaua á serle dulce la vida; i lo más que puede moueros es que partió inorante de vicios i calamidades, siendo incierto que le amenazaua la otra edad; que en los bienes solos son ciertos los que pasaron, i en los males los que no han venido, que es de suerte la vida llena de ellos, que ninguno la recibiría, si no se diese á los que no la conocen inespertos. Porque es ia costumbre, que la ultima parte délla ofenda con graues pecados la pureza de l'adolescencia, i contamine la felicidad de la juventud con desdichas; i en fin la presta muerte no solo le libró destos males, mas aun de los peligros; i aunque refirais lo que perdistes, pensad quanto es más lo que no temeis; y si bien lo comparais, más se le perdonó que quitó, que ai felicidad grande en la misma felicidad del morir. ¿Es justo pues, atormentaros por perderle, ó alegraros por tenerle tal? que mejor es auerle poseido que carecido dél, pues en pocos anos fué lo que pudo ser en muchos, i á nadie dió el cielo grandes i eternos bienes, que no dura hasta el fin, sino cansada i lenta la felicidad; i no aguarda al ultimo tiempo lo que al primero madura, que donde no ai aumento, está vecino el ocaseo. Aduertid pues, no sea de animo poco grato acordarse de auer pagado la deuda, i olvidarse de auerla recibido, porque el daros Dios ese niño fué de benignidad, i el pedirle,

de derecho, i el gozarle os fué de provecho, i no el perderle de daño; si no es que juzgue vuestro amor propio lo prestado; i más debeis al cielo, quanto fué mejor la prenda que os dió, i pudiendo no hacerlo sin agrauio, no os parezca auerle pedido sin tiempo, que el fruto de auerle tenido, ia le cojistes en amalle, i poseelle, de que se le debe agradecimiento, i no quejas de auerle llevado. Juzgo io en esta muerte no aueros quitado lo que os comunicó, pues en ella no falta el hombre, que según Socrates Platonico, es l'alma, siendo el cuerpo órgano, ó casa suia, ó mejor, cárcel o sepulcro, de que saliendo, nace más dichoso i viue libre. De cuia consideracion podeis gozar con el ánimo lo que no veis con los ojos, pues con el pensamiento se suele tratar con los amigos ausentes; i no sé si con más eficacia que quando viuo podeis conversalle i tenelle, porque no raras veces cansan las importunidades de la puericia, i la continuacion de la compañía es materia de ofensas, diminuiendo la dulçura del amor, que l'amistad i deseo no constan de la mezcla de los cuerpos, sino de las almas; i éstas, i no aquellos aman los que quieren verdaderamente, i ni fuerça, ni distancia de tiempos, ó lugares puede separar la union déllas, que es pueril cosa juzgar muerto al amigo ausente. Quantas veces pues quisieredes, haveis presente con el pensamiento i plática á vuestro hijo, i él alternatiuamente se acordará de su padre, i sentirá sus afectos, i en sueños con secretos modos los ánimos de los dos se abrasarán, i entenderán. Pensad en sus dichos i entendimiento, qual fué, i qual se podía esperar; reuocadle á la memoria siempre, lo qual conseguireis, si haceis la suia más suaue que lagrimosa, porque es natural al ánimo huir de aquello á que va con tristeza. ¿Qué os impide no imaginar que habitais con él, auiedo de viuir en el cielo de aquí á poco tiempo? No lloreis su pérdida auiendo engendrado á Dios. Él viue, i por ventura asiste á lo que escriuo, riéndose de vuestras lágrimas i mis consuelos; i si la inmortalidad no le ubiera privado de dolor, llorará que le lloreis, pues no es de amantes, sino de sí mismos querer por gusto el ageno agrauio. La vida que le falta, dadse la con vuestros escritos, que es eterna la memoria del ingenio; i mejor le consagrareis con las letras siempre viuidoras, que le llorareis con vano sentimiento. Con estas razones suelo remitir el mio, que quise haceros propias, no porque carezais destos remedios, sino porque cuidé convenir que con quien la pena es comun, comunicase el consuelo. Dios os guarde.

De Baltasar Eliseo de Medinilla.¹⁴

DECIMAS Á LA AUSENCIA.

Desconfianças de ausencia,
Hijas propias de mi amor,
Pues dais materia al dolor,
Dad valor á la paciencia.
Háceos mi honor resistencia
Por lo que teneis de celos,
Mas como el todo es desbelos
Da prebiniendo mudanças
Al sabio desconfianças,
Y á los honrados recelos.

Ríndeme vuestra porfía,
Ay de lo que amor padece,
Pues que por grande merece,
Y por grande desconfía.
Mi amor en mi alma os ería,
No ofendais al dueño mío,
Porque en aqueste desbío
Mostrarle umilde procuro,
Que si en su fé me aseguro,
En mi dicha desconfío.

Mas vuestro poder mirad,
Que con ser mucho mayor
Su lealtad que mi temor,
Vence el temor su lealtad.
Bien paga á su voluntad
(Si así su balor ofendo)
Lo que dél estoy temiendo,
Pues con culpas obligando,
Más bengo á estarle queriendo.

Dos causas en mí teneis,
Si la tercera negais,
Amor con que os enjendrais,
Ausencia con que creceis.
Mas no me lo negareis
Aunque os bea presumir
De hijos de saber sentir,
Que si es ynjenio dudar,
Bien puede desconfiar
Quien tan bien supo elegir.

Mostrais tanto en ausentaros,
Mis deseos verdaderos,
Que siendo culpa teneros,
E benido á desearos.
No me espanto con fíaros,
De mi amor desconfianças,
Aunque al ausencia esperanças
Da Celia de resistencias,
Que son efetos de ausencias
Los deseos, y mudanças.

Ya vibís en mí de asiento,
Y aunque procuro entretanto
Dibertiros con el llanto,
Con propio llanto os aumento.
Porque á tal merecimiento
Mirando mi amor agora
Teme alcançar, si le adora,
Y llorando amor porfía,
Que quien ama desconfía
Y tambien ama quien llora.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

A NOTE TO KÖRNER'S *LEIER
UND SCHWERT*.

One of the sonnets in Körner's *Leier und Schwert* bears a title which seems to be misapplied, and which has not been explained in any standard edition of the poet's works: *Vor Rauch's Büste der Königin Luise*, written in January, 1812. The work known to-day as "Rauch's bust of Queen Luise" could not have inspired Körner, as it was not made until 1816, three years after Körner's death; the most accessible reproduction of it is perhaps the one in Bigelow's *German Struggle for Liberty* (New York and London, 1903), vol. I, opposite page 8. This bust moreover represents a living woman, with eyes wide open, whereas the poet addresses the queen with the words: "Du schläfst so sanft," and "schlumm're fort," and "dann, DEUTSCHE FRAU! erwache." The sonnet is evidently an apostrophe to a likeness of the dead queen. This being the case, one thinks at once of Rauch's sarcophagus in the royal mausoleum in Charlottenburg. The representation of the lifeless queen there and the poet's address agree perfectly. But how could the full-length recumbent figure be called a "Büste"? and how could Körner have seen it since the sarcophagus was not made until 1813? An authenticated connection between the figure and the sonnet is established by means of Peschel-Wildenow's *Theodor Körner* (Leipzig, 1898), vol. I, page 328. Here we are told that Körner met Rauch in Vienna in

¹⁴ Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, MS. 3922, fol. 41-42b.

January, 1812, at the house of Humboldt, when Rauch was on his way to Italy to execute the sarcophagus, taking with him an "Abguss" of the head of the figure which he had made in Berlin, and which was later used in the execution of the complete sculpture. Körner's sonnet was therefore addressed to a bust of Queen Luise, but in reading the poem nowadays we are to think of the recumbent likeness of the queen on the sarcophagus in Charlottenburg.

GEO. M. PRIEST.

Princeton, N. J.

NOTES ON BEOWULF.

166-171. Sense is usually made out of this passage by taking 168 as adversative—"in spite of all this he [Grendel] could not molest the throne." (So, in general, Garnett, Earle, L. Hall, C. Hall.) The passage is usually regarded as a Christian interpolation; but it is hard to believe that even an interpolator would so far weaken the force of the description of Grendel's descent upon Heorot as to suggest that any portion of the hall was free from his molestation. Nor, admitting this, can we find a satisfactory explanation of *ne his myne wisse*. It is ridiculous to say that Grendel did not "share the sentiment" of the throne (Earle), or "did not know His [God's] purpose" (C. Hall); it seems equally unsatisfactory to adopt the old suggestion, "he [Grendel] scorned his [Hrothgar's] favors," as does Professor C. G. Child.

The chief difficulties disappear if we make the *hē* in 168 refer to Hrothgar. Hrothgar could not approach his own throne, precious in the sight of God (*or perhaps preferably*, that precious thing, standing before the eyes of God), nor did he [Hrothgar] at that time experience His favor." It is true that according to modern English standards, *hē* could refer only to Grendel, but in Old English poetry no such logical sequence can be expected. The simple use of a definite pronoun is suffi-

cient to indicate a change of subject. Proper names often seem indeed to be purposely withheld. Thus Beowulf himself, the hero of the poem, is not mentioned by name until 149 lines after his first appearance in the poem, though all this time he has been the chief person before us; so Grendel is vaguely referred to (100) as *ān*, before he is definitely named. This indefiniteness of subject contributes largely to the obscurity of the *Beowulf*. In this particular passage, the use of the definite *hē* (168) and of *wine Scyldinga* (170) seems to me sufficient indication that Hrothgar is the subject of the last four lines of the passage.

If this interpretation be accepted, the punctuation of the passage should be changed as follows:

*Heorot eardode,
sine-fāge sel sweartum nihtum.
Nō hē ðone gif-stōl grētan mōste,
māððum, for Metode, nē His myne wisse;
ðæt was wræc micel wine Scyldinga.*

311. *Lixte se lēoma ofer landa fela.*

This beautiful line, with its suggestive connotation, reminds one of Balder's house, Breidablik.

760. *Him fæste wiðfēng; fingras burston.*

This line immediately suggests two questions: Whose fingers are referred to? and, What is the meaning of *burston*? Dictionaries and glossaries give only the obvious meanings. It is a passage that must be interpreted by the translators. The German and English translators agree in referring the fingers to Beowulf, rendering variously, "his fingers cracked" (Garnett, C. Hall); "cracked as they would burst" (Earle); "crackled" (J. L. Hall); "burst" (Morris and Wyatt). Professor C. G. Child renders, "the fingers of the giant one snapped"; which is vague, but seems to refer to Beowulf.

None of the translators seems to have made sense out of the apparently simple *burston*. What is meant by saying that anybody's fingers crack, crackle, or snap? Probably the underlying idea of most of the translators is that Beowulf gripped so hard that his knuckles cracked, but to evolve this meaning from the

text requires an unjustifiably loose translation of both *fingras* and *burston*. I can find no other instance in Old English of *burston* for "cracked."

The passage should, I believe, be rendered literally, with the following signification, "[Grendel's] fingers burst [open and bled]." That the fingers referred to are Grendel's seems to be obvious from 764b-765:

*wiste his fingra geweald
on grames grāpum.*

We must understand that Beowulf has seized Grendel by the hand, and is gripping and pulling it so hard that blood bursts from under the finger-nails. The sudden shift of subject from one person to another is, as I have shown above, everywhere to be expected in the poem.

Exact parallels are found in *Nibelungenlied* B. 675,

*Si druht im sine hende daz ūz den nageln spranc
daz pluot im von ir Krefte;*

also in *Nib.* C. 657; and in *Salman und Morolt* 1609. The incident is common in modern novels; see e. g., *A Lear of the Steppes*, § 2, and *Micah Clarke*, chap. 21.

783. *Norð-Denum stōd
atelic egesa ānra gehwylcum,
ðāra ðe of wealle wōp gehȳrdon,
gryrelōð galan Godes ondsacan.*

Line 785 is usually rendered, "those who, from the wall, heard the howling," though Dr. C. Hall leaves the matter vague, and Professor Child ignores it altogether. Wyatt says in his glossary that *weal* means "burgh-wall," and some have felt that the appellation "North-Danes" also served to indicate that *wealle* here means "city-wall," as though we should translate, "the Danes who listen from the northern part of the city-wall." But "North-Danes" appears to be quite without significance here, for the same people have been variously called East-, West-, and South-Danes. Moreover, the translation "burgh-wall" is probably incorrect, since city-walls are nowhere referred to in the *Beowulf*, and are to be thought of, in general,

as belonging to a later period (cf. Gummere, *Germanic Origins*, pp. 90 ff.).

Dr. C. Hall in his preliminary note to this passage (p. 45), suggests, "Danes on the neighbouring castle-wall." But this seems unsatisfactory, Heorot being built of wood, and simple in its construction. No fortifications other than the walls of the building itself are mentioned; the outlying "bowers" (140) are probably adjoining huts, surely not a neighboring castle.

The wall of Heorot itself is the only one of importance enough to be mentioned, and we must, I think, render, "The North Danes who heard the howling from the wall[s] [of Heorot]," or more freely, "who heard the howling in the house."

815 ff. In the *Mabinogion* ("Pwyle, Prince of Dyved," near end), there is an incident of a giant claw that seizes new-born colts. The claw belongs to a monster of mysterious nature, who, like Grendel, is also a creature of the night. Like Grendel, again, he escapes leaving his arm behind him. Lady Guest's translation reads:

"And Teirnyon rose up, and looked at the size of the colt, and as he did so he heard a great tumult, and after the tumult, behold a claw came through the window into the house, and it seized the colt by the mane. Then Teirnyon drew his sword, and struck off the arm at the elbow, so that portion of the arm, together with the colt, was in the house with him. And then did he hear a tumult and a wailing both at once." (Cf. *Beo.* 786-87).

CHAUNCEY B. TINKER.

Yale University.

ITALIAN ACTORS IN SCOTLAND.

The following records of payments to Italian actors in Scotland are worthy of notice as showing early continental influence on the British drama. The record of 1517 shows that four Italian actors,—probably four of the

six mentioned in the record of 1516,—received a money payment on their return.

1514. "Et histrionibus Italicis in octo libris et octo solidis in eorum feodis . . ." ¹

1516. "Et per solutionem factam sex histrionibus Ytalis domini gubernatoris in triginta quinque libris per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dominis auditoribus testantibus preceptum, et dictis histrionibus fatentibus solutionem super compotum xxxv li." ²

An. 1517. "Et quatuor histrionibus Ytalis in recessu ipsorum pro benevolentia de mandato dicti domini gubernatoris literatorio ostenso super compotum lx li." ³

Next year there is a payment to a number of Italian and Scotch performers who were both trumpeters and actors. Scotch Latinization of foreign names is very irregular, and it is hard to distinguish the Italians from the Scotchman in the list. Pais occurs elsewhere in the Rolls ⁴ in company with one Guillaume, and is evidently a foreigner. To these performers are also given measures of barley, grain, and a goodly number of capons.

An. 1518. "In primis allocatur compotanti per solutionem factam Juliano Drummond, Vincenti Pais, Sebastiano Drummond, Georgio Forest, et Juliano Rokkett, tubicinis et histrionibus Italicis et Scotis [£155. 3. 4.]," also "una celdra duabus bollis ordeii undecim martis ⁵ sex duodenis caponum," ⁶ etc.

The following payment probably refers to the same five performers.

An. 1518. "Et per solutionem factam quinque tubicinis Italicis in quinquaginta quinque libris et novem solidis per preceptum domini gubernatoris, dicto precepto manu sua subscripto ostenso super compotum lv li. ix s.

Et dictis tubicinis Italicis in quinquaginta una libris preter firmas et devorias domini de Garviauch in rotulo anni, etc. V decimi octavi dictis tubicinis allocatas, per preceptum dicti domini gubernatoris ostensum super compotum li li." ⁷

George Forest signs the receipts for the players in 1522.

An. 1522. "Et eidem per solutionem factam Italicis tubicinis de firmis terrarum thanagii de Kintor in centum septuaginta octo libris novemdecim solidis et quatuor denariis per perceptum domini gubernatoris et Roberti Bertoune, rotuloris, dictis tubicinis per binas suas quittantias manu Georgei Forrest, unius tubicinarum, subscriptas fatentibus solutionem super compotum [£178. 19. 4]." ⁸

The same year is recorded another money payment, with more barley and capons.

An. 1522. "Que firme et devoria predicta dicti domini de Garviauch assignatur sex tubicinis Italicis et Scotis in partem solutionis gagiorum et feodorum ipsorum, quilibet eorum precipiens in anno triginta octo libras et decem solidos" . . . ; ⁹ also "[4] celdre ¹⁰ [8] bolle ordeii [44] marte, [18] duodene caponum 48 duodene pultriarum."

Records of payments to Italian trumpeters continue with hardly any interruption up to the year 1561. In 1526 their salaries (£38. 10. 0), are made chargeable on the fermes and dues of the lordship of Garviauch, ¹¹ and payments are made accordingly in the years 1523, 1525, 1526 and 1527. ¹² But in 1529 it is directed that no further payments are to be made without the express command of the King ("sine expresso mandato domini regis"). ¹³ The old salary, however, is paid from the king's treasury in 1530, ¹⁴ and fairly regularly thereafter up to 1561. Beginning with 1547 there are separate payments to the Queen's trumpeters. But with 1561 mention of Italian trumpeters ceases; and as if to make a distinction, the payments thereafter ¹⁵ are usually said to be to "ordinary trumpeters." Thus in 1574 there is a payment to "quinque tubicinis ordinariis"; ¹⁶ and again in the same year "to the five ordinary trumpeters of the King"; ¹⁷ and again in 1588, "to the saidis ordiner trumpettis." ¹⁸

⁸ *Id.*, p. 431.

⁹ *Id.*, p. 423. These are, of course, pounds Scots (= one-twelfth of the English pound); and shillings Scots (= English penny).

¹⁰ celdra = 'measure.'

¹¹ *Id.*, xv, 220, 494.

¹² *Id.*, pp. 30, 156, 245, 312 respectively.

¹³ *Id.*, p. 495.

¹⁴ *Id.*, xvi, p. 5.

¹⁵ 1574-1588.

¹⁶ *Id.*, xx, 165.

¹⁷ *Id.*, 329.

¹⁸ *Id.*, 398.

¹ *Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*, xiv (1513-1522), p. 8.

² *Id.*, p. 220.

³ *Id.*, p. 285.

⁴ *Lord High Treasurer's Accounts*, cclxi.

⁵ Oxen.

⁶ *Rolls*, p. 300.

⁷ *Id.*, p. 353.

These records show Italian players in Scotland sixty-three years before there is any record of them in England, and thirty-four years before there is any record of them in France. Their first appearance in the latter country is said by Brantôme to have been on September 28th, 1548, at the court of Henry II.¹⁹ Petit de Julleville states, however, that there were Italian players of farces at Paris in the time of Francis I.²⁰ This would still be later than the appearance of the Italians in Scotland.

In the record of payment in 1516 to the players, and in some of the other records, they are said to be "domini gubernatoris,"—the Lord Governor's. The Lord Governor, or Regent at this time was the Duke of Albany, a Frenchman. James V came to the Scotch throne at the age of eighteen months. A governor being necessary, an embassy was sent to France to offer the regency to Albany. He landed on May 18, 1515, and left again temporarily for France in May, 1517. The players of 1516 are certainly his; and four of them left Scotland in the same year as he himself, probably returning with him to France. There are, then, two of the original six Italian performers still remaining in Scotland. We may be reasonably sure that Vincent Pais²¹ of the record of 1518 is one of these original six.

Albany returned to Scotland in 1521, and ordered two payments to be made to Italian and Scotch trumpeters in 1522.²² The fact that George Forrest who is one of the company of five "tubicinis et histrionibus" in 1518, signs the receipt, serves to identify the company. Though this company is not called by the name of "histriones" after 1518, there is very little doubt that it was an acting company

in fact. For with only one exception the company of five Italians and Scotchman, called "tubicines" in 1526²³ is in personnel exactly the same as that called "tubicines et histriones" in 1518.²⁴ We may conclude that this original Italian company continued to combine the arts of acting and trumpeting, until it disappeared from the records in 1561.

In the first entry (1514), the players are not named "the Lord Governor's," and in fact are settled in Scotland, and receiving a payment before the arrival of Albany. The invitation to Albany, was, however, sent in 1513. The Duke, who was Admiral of France, was at first disinclined to leave his country, but at once dispatched as his agent the Seigneur de la Bastie. This knight had been in Scotland in 1506-7, and had won rich gifts.²⁵ From 1508 to 1513 he had been fighting in Italy for the cause of Louis XII, and from there he went almost directly to Scotland. He appears at the general council which met at Perth, October 19th to November 26th, 1513.²⁶ Possibly the Seigneur de la Baste brought Italian players of his own with him, or players belonging to Albany, or players whom later Albany attached to himself. It is, however, safe to conclude from the appearance of Italian players in Scotland at the time the country was coming under the rule of Frenchmen, and from the dependence of these players upon Frenchmen, that Italian players were known at the courts of French noblemen in the earliest years of the sixteenth century,—a fact of importance for the history of early French comedy.

JOHN A. LESTER.

The Hill School, Pottstown, Pa.

¹⁹ Brantôme, *Grands Capitaines François:—Le Grand Roy Henry II* (Œuvres Complètes, ed. L. Lalanne, Paris, 1867), III, 250, 256.

²⁰ *Les Comédiens en France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1885), p. 357, n.

²¹ There is a John Pais, "tawbronar," i. e., drummer, mentioned as having received four payments, 1496-7, in *Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer* (ed. Dickson, Edin., 1877), pp. 280, 326, 340, 360.

²² *Exchequer Rolls*, XIV, 424, 431.

²³ *Id.*, XV, 220.

²⁴ *Id.*, XIV, 220.

²⁵ For his romantic career in Scotland vid. *Blackwood* (July, 1893), Vol. 154, pp. 132-144.

²⁶ *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, article on James V, p. 154.

WHY NOT A FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE?

In his conjugation of the verb, Prof. J. M. D. Meiklejohn, in his *English Grammar*¹ (page 56), classes the forms *I should strike*, *I should be striking*, and *I should have struck* as, respectively, the future indefinite, the future imperfect, and the future perfect tense-forms of the subjunctive mood, thus making them correspond with the similar future tense-forms of the indicative mood. For such a classification there is justification both in reason and in convenience.

Shall and *will* are used, as is well known, both as notional verbs and as auxiliary verbs. When used as a notional verb, the past tense-form of *shall* is *should*, and of *will* is *would*; the meanings which each has as a notional verb are retained, the time in which these meanings are predicated being merely changed to the past. But it is easy to show that there are many cases in which *should* and *would* have no meanings of their own, but are as truly auxiliary verbs as are *shall* and *will*.

Will when used as a notional verb signifies wish, desire, inclination, purpose, intention, etc. In the sentence, "John will be punished in spite of his plea for mercy," the context excludes any of the meanings which are possible to *will* as a notional verb, and permits it to be classed only as an auxiliary verb, helping to form a future tense-form of the main verb "punished." If we put this sentence into indirect discourse after a past tense-form of the verb "say," we shall have the following: "Henry said that John *would* be punished in spite of John's plea for mercy." Does *would* in this sentence any more express a wish, purpose, intention, etc., than *will* does in the direct form? And if *will* is an auxiliary verb in the direct form, is not *would* necessarily an auxiliary in the indirect? But an auxiliary of what, if not an auxiliary of some mood?

Again, take a sentence like the following:

¹ *The English Language: its Grammar, History, and Literature*, by J. M. D. Meiklejohn, M. A., D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, New York, and Chicago, 1897.

"Notwithstanding his innocence, if he were here now he *would* be hanged." Can *would* in this sentence by any reasonable interpretation be construed as a notional verb, expressing past wish, desire, purpose, or intention? Or in a sentence like this: "If his own brother *would* steal John's purse, John *would* be disgraced," will the context permit to be given to *would* any one of the meanings which it must have in order to be classified as a notional verb?

If, then, in sentences like the above, *would* and *should* can not be notional verbs, it is necessary that they be auxiliary verbs; and inasmuch as they show the manner in which the action of the verb is presented to the mind, it follows that they are auxiliaries of mood—that they are "helping verbs" in the formation of the tense-forms of some mood. The question is, Of what mood are they auxiliaries?

Nearly a third of a century ago Dr. William Dwight Whitney, in his "Essentials of English Grammar"² (page 120), called attention to these forms, and classed them as "conditional forms" because they are "especially used to express a conditional assertion." But inasmuch as their use in expressing conditions is only one of several functions belonging to these forms, together with the fact that other forms likewise are used in expressing conditions, we can hardly regard the reasons given by Dr. Whitney as entirely sufficient for calling them the "conditional mood," and thus adding another to the number of moods which the student will have to learn. There are better reasons for classing them merely as future tense-forms of the subjunctive mood.

In the first place, all of the functions of the auxiliary forms *would* and *should* are properly subjunctive functions—they are functions that belong to the subjunctive mood in languages generally, and that go to make up the very conception of the mood itself. Indeed, they are functions which are regularly expressed by the subjunctive mood in the Old English period of our own language.

Again, to class these as future tense-forms

² *Essentials of English Grammar*, by William Dwight Whitney, Boston, Ginn & Heath, 1877.

of the subjunctive but completes the cycle of the tense forms of that mood. The subjunctive already has a full complement of present and of past tense-forms. Why should it not be possible to predicate action or state under the subjunctive modifications, in future time as well as in present or in past time? In this we have a most apt analogy in the German—the closest akin of all our cognate languages—which has in the subjunctive mood future tense-forms similar to those which it has in the indicative.

Probably the strongest reasons for classing as future subjunctives the forms in which *would* and *should* appear as auxiliaries, is the practical advantage which it serves. It is an exceedingly convenient classification, both in outlining the conjugations of the verb, and in explaining the more difficult principles of English syntax. After an experience of almost a decade with this method, the writer does not hesitate to say that the constructions for indirect discourse, for conditions contrary-to-fact (unreal conditions), for less vivid future conditions (ideal conditions), and the like, can be made much simpler, and that the co-ordination of these English constructions with similar constructions in German, Latin, and Greek is immensely facilitated, if these forms are classed as future tense-forms of the subjunctive mood.

Is there any good reason why these forms should not be classed as future subjunctive tense-forms? And if not, with the arguments mentioned above in favor of this classification, ought it not to be more generally adopted by the authors of our text-books on English grammar?

E. B. SETZLER.

Newberry College, South Carolina.

A NOTE ON SHAKESPEARE.

For many years I have felt that the word *rouse*, 'intoxication, a drinking frolic,' which occurs four times in Shakespeare, has not been satisfactorily explained by the annotators or

in most of the dictionaries. The word is common in all the Scandinavian languages in the form *rus*, which means 'a carouse, a fit of intoxication.' For example in Danish, *at tage sig en rus* or *at faa sig en rus*, 'to indulge in a spree'; *at sove rusen ud*, 'to sleep off one's debauch, sleep oneself sober.' The word must have been borrowed from the Danish, as pointed out by Professor Skeat, in whose *Etymological Dictionary* it is correctly explained. In the other dictionaries, except the Shakespearean, *rouse* is defined as meaning a bumper, though Webster adds "a drinking frolic." Schmidt, in his *Shakespeare Lexicon* defines the word as "free and copious drinking, a full measure of liquor"; and Phin in his *Shakespeare Cyclopaedia and New Glossary*, as "a bumper; a copious draft of liquor," referring to *Hamlet*, I, 2, 127; I, 4, 8, and *Othello*, II, 3, 66; and as "a carouse; a drinking feast," referring to *Hamlet*, II, 1, 58. The annotators almost invariably explain the word as meaning simply a 'bumper'; yet in Shakespeare it evidently means the same as in the language from which it was borrowed, at least in three of the four passages. These passages are the following: *Hamlet*, I, 2, 127: "And the king's rouse the heavens shall bruit again"; *Hamlet*, I, 4, 8: "The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse"; *Hamlet*, II, 1, 58: "There was he gaming, there o'ertook in's rouse"; and *Othello*, II, 3, 66: "'Fore God, they have given me a rouse already."

In all these cases Professor Rolfe explains *rouse* as meaning 'a bumper,' though in the last case he adds "too deep a draft." Professor Dowden in his edition of *Hamlet* makes it 'bumper' in all the four cases. In Dr. Furness's Variorum Edition, where one naturally looks for the best criticism on all Shakespearean questions, there is no intimation that the editor has perceived the true explanation. Under the first case Dr. Furness quotes Wedgwood's antiquated etymology, but does not hint what he thinks the word may mean. Under the second he quotes Gifford's definition of *rouse* as meaning "a large glass in which a health was given." On "o'ertook in's rouse"

he quotes from Clarendon: "That is, by intoxication. One of the many euphemisms for drink," which is the nearest to the truth of all his notes, quoted or original. Under the passage in *Othello* he again quotes Gifford's definition. Phin, Schmidt, and Skeat, whose explanation is the best, are not even mentioned. It seems as if Gifford's definition had fixed the matter for all time in the mind of the annotators and most of the lexicographers. And yet this explanation is manifestly wrong so far as the passages in Shakespeare are concerned, however much the word elsewhere may have the meaning of 'bumper.'

In the first passage, "And the king's rouse the heavens shall bruit again," a very little thought will convince the reader that it is not the king's bumper that is to be bruited, but his draining of it, or rather his drinking or getting drunk, without reference to a single bumper, for we must suppose him to drain several at a sitting. In the second, "The king doth wake to-night and takes his rouse," the meaning is that the king is having his (customary) carouse, *tager sin rus*. In the third passage, "There was he gaming, there o'ertook in's rouse," it is absurd to say that the king or any other man can be overtaken in a bumper, though there is very evident sense in saying that a man may be overtaken in drunkenness. In the passage in *Othello*, "Fore God, they have given me a rouse already," the word *rouse* might possibly mean a bumper; yet there is not much point in Cassio's saying so. He says in effect, "They have made me intoxicated already." So it appears that in the three passages in which the word is found in *Hamlet* it can mean only one thing, 'a fit of drunkenness, a spree'; and also in the passage in *Othello*, 'intoxication' is the most likely meaning.

In the passages quoted in the dictionaries and in notes to Shakespeare's plays to illustrate the meaning of the word *rouse*, it seems in most cases to have the same meaning as in Shakespeare. The passages I have seen are the following:—

He took his *rouse* with stoups of Rhenish wine,
from Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*;

Your lord, by his patent,
Stands bound to take his *rouse*,

from Massinger's *Duke of Milan*, act I, scene 1;

Fill the cup, and fill the can,
Have a *rouse* before the morn,

from Tennyson's *Vision of Sin*; in all of which the meaning of 'intoxication' is the only possible one.

I have taken, since supper,
A *rouse* or two too much, and by [the gods],
It warms the blood,

from Beaumont and Fletcher's *Knight of Malta*, is the only passage I have seen in which the definition of 'bumper' is suitable.

It appears, then, that in English literature generally, and in Shakespeare in particular, the word *rouse* means 'intoxication, a carousal,' and that no other explanation is admissible in Shakespeare.

ALBERT E. EGGE.

Pullman, Washington.

A NEW PLAY BY JOHN FORD.

I.

As the thirteenth volume of "Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas," Professor Bang publishes an admirable edition of an old play, *The Queen or the Excellency of Her Sex*, which he attributes to John Ford. The *Queen* has an interesting, though not an illustrious history; it seems to have slept in undisturbed oblivion since 1653, when it was temporarily resuscitated by the actor Alexander Goughe. This Goughe was one of the melancholy survivors of the Last Judgment of 1642. On evil days though fallen, Goughe stuck to his calling, and played his part in those surreptitious and hazardous theatrical performances with which, in the reign of Puritan righteousness, the old lovers of the drama had to content themselves. The congratulatory verses prefixed to the play give vigorous expression to the resentment at the rigor of rulers

who interfered with personal liberty, and at the bigotry of priests who admit

"Onely a grave formality for wit."

In the poem of "T. C," there is a fine note of defiance:

"Yet the more Generous race of men revives
This Lamp of Knowledge, and like Primitives
In Caves, fearless of Martyrdom, rehearse
The almost breathless, now, Dramatick verse."

Some of the members of this fraternity of histrionic martyrs eked out their hand-to-mouth existence, says Wright (quoted by Professor Bang), "by publishing copies of plays never before printed, but kept in manuscript." The hunger of Goughe, then, may have preserved the *Queen*. The title page of the quarto informs us that this "Excellent old Play" was "Found out by a Person of Honour, and given to the Publisher, Alexander Goughe." But it gives no hint of the author.

The scholar who commits himself on the authorship of an anonymous old play takes his life in his hands; there are few more daring things that he can do, and there is no more searching test of his scholarship. In the graceful foreword to the edition of the *Queen*, Professor Bang speaks of his delight in making the discovery, and incidentally furnishes the materials for testing the validity of his judgment. From his *Gymnasium* days, he has been an admiring student of Ford; he has worked on the problem of distinguishing the authors in the Ford-Dekker plays; the voice of Ford has become like that of an old friend; and he has heard it again in the *Queen*. He has a wise skepticism of rhyme tests and other mechanical formulas. Long familiarity with his author, a genuine relish for the true Ford flavor, an immediate sense of the idiosyncracies of his style:—that is the basis on which Professor Bang makes his decision, and that, in the absence of external evidence, is the only sufficient basis. To those intimate with Ford, the corroborative testimony of vocabulary, parallel passages, etc., is interesting but almost superfluous. Since the general acceptance of Ford's

authorship depends upon the consent of those who can, or think they can, recognize Ford's voice when they hear it, it behooves all such to express an opinion. When I first heard that the *Queen* had been attributed to Ford, I fortunately had access to the old quarto, and there read the play for the first time, unbiassed by notes or comment. Ford had been my pretty constant companion for several years, and I repeated Professor Bang's experience—an immediate sense of the author. Subsequent readings have only deepened my certainty that the author of the *Broken Heart* was the author of the *Queen*.

II.

The central interest of the *Queen* is, characteristically, an affair of the heart. The main action may to advantage be detached from the gross parasitical under-plot. Alphonso, leader of an insurrection against the Queen of Aragon, has, at the opening of the play, been defeated, captured and sentenced to death. Just as the axe is falling upon his disloyal neck, the Queen enters. It now appears that Alphonso is a young, enthusiastic crank, enraged, for reasons unknown, against the whole female sex.

"I hate your sex in general, not you
As y' are a Queen, but as y' are a woman:
Had I a term of life could last for ever,
And you could grant it, yes, and would, yet all
Or more should never reconcile my heart
To any she alive."

This ungallant speech seems rather to please the Queen than otherwise. In spite of insults and protests, she insists on pardoning him. Shortly afterwards, she marries him and crowns him king. At this point, Alphonso requests her to remain apart from him for a week that he may atone for his ill thoughts against her sex.

A month has passed, and still the king has not taken his wife. Her friends sue to him in her behalf; but he is obdurate. Then the Queen herself enters, like Esther to Ahasuerus, unannounced, and begs for his forgiveness and

love. She is soft and seductive,—tries to find a way into his heart. The King is visibly moved, but to rage. He cries out upon her for an enchantress; he will not lay his royalty "beneath an antick woman's feet." In his wrath, he says, absolutely without reason, that he has no faith in her honesty. Finally, he bids her go live chaste, as he does; so, he banishes her from his presence. She retires, hurt and sad, but loving him still.

In the third act, Muretto, the benevolent and bloodless Iago of the play, has persuaded Alphonso that the Queen is indeed dishonest, that she is in love with innocent young Lord Petruchi. She, meanwhile, is beating her brains for a device to gain her husband's favor; she would fain come before him in a chariot carved out of a single diamond and drawn by ivory steeds. The King summons her before him; accuses her of adultery, and sentences her to death, unless a champion shall appear and, in single combat with him, establish her honor. The Queen, in a fine moment of exaltation, forbids all who love her to fight on her behalf against her husband.

The fourth act contains what is in itself an interesting and really effective psychological study. The well-intentioned Muretto has been working on the King's feelings. In the face of the death that he has decreed, the Queen is growing more beautiful to him. Confronted with her, he has a bitter sense of her sinful loveliness. He is torn by the agonizing inner struggle of love and morbid jealousy.

"Between my comforts and my shame I stand
In equal distance; this way let me turn
To thee, thou woman. Let me dull mine eyes
With surfeit on thy beauty. What art thou
Great dazeling splendor? let me ever look
And dwell upon this presence."

But he persuades himself, by shutting his eyes and ears, that he is influenced only by her physical attractions, and dismisses her.

By the time that the trial by arms is reached, the King is ready to be defeated; yet he is perversely bent upon going through the ordeal. The speech with which he addresses the assembled lords must be quoted:

"Lords welcome, see thus arm in arm we pace
To the wide theater of blood and shame
My Queen and I, my Queen? had shee bin still
As shee was, mine, we might have liv'd too happ'ly,
For eithers comfort. Heer on this sweet modell,
This plott of wonder, this fair face, stands fixt
My whole felicity on earth. In witnes
Whereof, behold (my Lords) those manly tears
Which her unkindnes and my cruell fate
Force from their quiet springs. They speak alowd
To all this open ayre, their publick eyes,
That whither I kill or dy in this attempt
I shall in both be vanquisht."

Here is a cadence worthy of Ford at his best, an accent worthy of the spacious times of great Elizabeth, and of a much better man than Alphonso. To the mind of every reader of Ford, I think these lines will inevitably recall the musical words and pious tears of Giovanni before killing his sister. It is all perfectly in Ford's manner. There is the conventional suspense before a champion appears. Then, at a blast of the trumpet, enters the Queen's General, Velasco. The Queen entreats him not to fight, and swoons when he refuses to comply. At the second trumpet blast, Lord Petruchi appears. At the third, Muretto, the benevolent Iago. Of course, the King is confounded at this last champion, and demands an explanation. Muretto replies, in effect: I saw that the King was set against the sex, and planned to cure him of his eccentricity. I effected my laudable purpose by mixing insinuations of the Queen's faithlessness with suggestions of her beauty; so, brought the King to love his wife. Applaud my ingenuity and success. They all applaud, and thenceforth live in felicity.

III.

The obvious criticism upon this play is that it is theatrical. This is no "transcript from life;" this sex-dual in which woman is the aggressor is an affair of the stage-world—a sort of heroic anticipation of Mr. Shaw's *Man and Superman*. The author has taken no pains to make his story plausible; he has not told us how Alphonso became such an inveterate woman-hater; he has given no adequate explanation of the insurrection; he has supplied

no adequate motive for Alphonso's jealousy. The hero is a thing of shreds and patches. The great character of the play is undoubtedly the Queen. If our imagination can furnish a motive for her devotion to her morbid and fanatical subject, we can scarcely refuse our admiration to the lofty ardor and intensity of her passion. It is unnatural, but it is heroic. By her daring and high-pitched spirit, by her haughty humility, she reminds us of Calantha; but in her readiness to have her head cut off by her husband, she suggests patient Griselda. As Chaucer informs us, Griselda and her patience are dead and buried together in Italy.

The artificiality of the play is instructive; it points straight at Ford as the author. It consists not merely in the inadequate motivation of the characters; it is in the soul of the plot. The germinal idea, as I take it, is this: A man suffering from diseased notions of love and women is restored by psychological treatment to a normal state of mind. The King and the Queen are more or less humanized puppets, manipulated by the master of the show in certain typical and exciting crises of love, jealousy, and remorse to illustrate the treatment of mental aberration. The King is the patient, Muretto is the doctor, the Queen is the cure. In real life, Muretto would have been beheaded; here, he is hailed as a triumphant physician. Now, the germinal idea of the *Queen* is identical with that of Ford's first published play, the *Lover's Melancholy*. The theme of that highly artificial production is the curing of Palador, Meleander and the rest, who are all suffering severely from various forms of "melancholy,"—a real physician, Corax, is the hero of the cure.

The key to both of these plays and, indeed, one of the best commentaries on Ford's work, is Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. That great analysis of the diseases of the mind,—itself the product of a somewhat diseased mind,—seems to have affected Ford profoundly. It supplied him with a method and formula. Erudite in the symptoms of heart trouble, he bends his energies to depicting the

characteristic aspects of the major passions. He can portray a jealous man, a heart-broken woman, a vengeful or remorseful man, or a love-smitten woman with masterful power; he knows the symptoms, and records them, every one. But he is comparatively deficient in the power of exhibiting the subtle knots of cause and effect in a connected story of passion. Frequently, therefore, he sets to work in a very mechanical way to contrive occasions for his characters. Having no great fertility of invention, he all too often contents himself with presenting an interesting character in a flimsy patchwork of poorly connected scenes. His work is remarkably uneven; like many other men of limited genius, he had two or three good things in him, produced them, and then went pattering on from bad to worse. His work falls into two divisions: that in which the subject took hold of him, and that in which he took hold of the subject. In the first class, are the *Broken Heart*, *'Tis Pity*, and *Love's Sacrifice*. It is a noteworthy fact that the *Broken Heart* is all in verse. The whole play seems to have been inspired; there is no time nor place in the story for padding or buffoonery. *'Tis Pity* contains some prose and underplot, but the work is firm and coherent—the comic characters are swept into the whirlpool of the tragic plot. *Love's Sacrifice* is less cleanly constructed; the tragic action is interrupted and impeded by the impertinent and revolting scenes of the underplot. In the *Fancies* and the *Lady's Trial*, the underplot sprawls wantonly over the main action. The author falls into hopeless padding and pattering; a few scenes of power are dislocated by long and futile scenes without mirth or sense. The *Queen* is a much better play than the *Fancies* or the *Lady's Trial*, but, on the whole, I think it belongs in the class with them. Ford had not the energy or invention to fill out the five acts with the story of the Queen and her King. Only by the aimless quarrels of a "rascal rout" and the flat and disgusting love affair of the incomprehensible widow Salassa are the two or three inspired scenes of the main plot held together. If the *Queen* were a new play by a contemporary

writer, I think the critics would say, in effect: This tragi-comedy exhibits Ford's characteristic merits and defects; it occasionally rises to the tragic pitch of *'Tis Pity* and the *Broken Heart*, but it sinks still more frequently to the flatness of the *Fancies*; on the whole, we do not think it will greatly enhance the reputation of its author.

STUART P. SHERMAN.

University of Illinois.

FRENCH LIFE.

LANGLOIS, CH.-V., *La vie en France au moyen-âge d'après quelques moralistes du temps*. Paris: Hachette, 1908. 12mo. xix + 359 pp.

This work represents a third venture, by its author, into a region of research where history and philology elements converge. The method is a very ingenious application; the writer executes his task in such a way that both sciences are at work in the one field at the same moment. His plea is that Romance philologists are not sufficiently aware of the documents which scholars have to use who concern themselves directly with history material and, *vice versa*, that historians of the Middle Ages rather incline to neglect the literary monuments of this period because they consider these documents to be within the exclusive control of the philologists.

M. Langlois is a living example in scholarship of the synthesis of these two branches of research, which he employs to illuminate Mediæval conditions of life in their manifold aspects. His prime purpose is to show that Mediæval life is, essentially, no whit removed from that of contemporary civilization, and therefore worthy of the claim of human interest which men of these times attach to this present age.

Seventeen years ago there was printed in the *Revue Bleue* (1891) an article on: *La société du moyen-âge d'après les fabliaux*; the second

work on similar lines, but of much finer elaboration, appeared four years ago in: *La société française au XIII^e siècle d'après dix romans d'aventure*; the third contribution of the same order, just published, exhibits the cumulative working of its two predecessors, both in the perfection of method and the conciseness of its details. Owing to the considerate reception accorded to the *Société française*, M. Langlois was induced to follow on with the study he has but just completed; it can be said with all sincerity that this recent work has improved in every particular on the volume of 1904.

The book before us presents its readers with a decade of moralist writers of the thirteenth century employing the French language, though not all of them Frenchmen. The body of the work is made up of a modern French rendering of the best didactic thought which these moralists have left us; the translation or version of M. Langlois assumes the form of abridged paraphrase with intercalated quotations of the original texts, aimed to preserve, as far as may be, the early inspiration and natural expression of the Mediæval writer. A foreword introduces each author's moralisms, embodying biographical and linguistic detail as well,—the latter element, of course, not intended exactly for the general reader. Throughout this work are to be found an unusually large number of notes, the practical value of which, to any but specialists, will be a minimum.

To sum up in one short phrase the function of the book, one can say that within the simple compass of a few hundred pages it will be possible for the layman to find his road through what would be otherwise an endless mass of material which very few men have dared to approach hitherto except for technical purposes. M. Langlois has chosen conscientiously these ten exponents of moralistic literature of the thirteenth century in order to afford the modern general reader, and the scholar as well, a representation of the life of this period as seen from the religious critic's view-point. Of these ten writers, no less than seven can be consulted directly in printed editions of recent

date and scholarship and within easy access for purposes of reference. The author offers, moreover, to those of his readers who can follow the subject more readily a fund of explanatory material from the *Histoire littéraire, Romania* and the *Zeitschrift* upon which he depends quite often for decisions concerning authorship, sources and dates; he would not have gone very wide to include among these manuals the *Einführung* of Voretzsch (Halle, 1905), a very serviceable book for bibliographical data in this general connection.

It is not to be expected, of course, that the same intense human interest should characterize this present work as inheres in the volume drawn from the *romans d'aventure*. A century like the age of Louis IX which begins with the *Poème moral* and ends with Gilles li Muisis, counting also the moralists in between whom M. Langlois has gathered together in one group, is not required to furnish as many human elements as it would be obliged to do when contemplated from the standpoint of the *romans d'aventure*. At the outset, therefore, one might expect to meet in the volume before us a somewhat tasteless sort of thing were it not that the author has expended a great amount of scholarly tact in the treatment of his theme; he endeavors to minimize the *fâcheux renom de la littérature moralisante du moyen-âge*, and he has succeeded in his undertaking as few men before him have ever been privileged to do. Notwithstanding this, there remains a conviction in the reader's mind, upon a perusal of the book, that these moralists are monotonous, and even tedious, with their endless generalities and repeated arraignment of mortal errors. The reiteration of this discipline through the successive writers of the volume produces a wearisome effect in the long run. As an offset to this objectionable feature, if it be objectionable, it is not to be wondered at, of course, that M. Langlois appears to be over-jealous at times in the defense of these didactic writers. He resents, for instance, the term: *austère gentilhomme*, applied by M. Lenient to Hugues de Berzé, as a misconception. Yet one needs but glance through the so-called

Bible of Berzé to feel that the term fits very adequately. His estimate of: *Le petit plet* of Chardri and the *Floris et Liriope* of Robert de Blois seem unusually strange.

Of the entire collection of writers whom M. Langlois has grouped together for his purpose, possibly the *Fauvel* of Gervais du Bus, a Parisian, responds best to the title of the book; it is the shortest and the keenest, in a human sense, of the whole list.¹ *Fauvel* is the *beste autentique* imaged in tapestries and other Mediaeval decorations as the object of a most fulsome attention from men of all estates both low and high. Even the Pope is represented in this work as causing *Fauvel* to be led into his holiness' presence when the Pontiff condescends to stroke the animal gently, saying at the same moment: *Ci a bele beste*. This is the *Fauvel* that has come over into the English phrase: *to curry favor* (*étriller Fauvel*), where the original word has changed its form and, in part, its early connotation. The only prose work in this collection is that by Philippe de Novare d'Outremer, entitled: *Des IIII tenz d'aage d'ome*,² a work of rare distinction for those days in one particular at least, namely, that no research whatever is required for the investigation of the sources of Philippe. The essay is original with the author and unfolds his personal opinions upon the times in which he lived. M. Langlois considers Philippe de Novare the sole writer of the thirteenth century worthy a place next to de Joinville in quality of merit; the substance of his composition is a survey of man's life in its four progressive stages of twenty years each. The venerable old man has added to his main work no less than three post-scripta of some twenty pages in all at the close of the fourth period. A like addition is easily the privilege of advanced years, or must be taken as such, in the case of Philippe de Novare and his musings.

Following, in point of interest, the two writings just mentioned are the *Lamentations*

¹ Cf. *Histoire litt.*, v. xxxii, pp. 108-153, for a synopsis and commentary of this poem.

² In the *S. D. A. T.*, vol. 27, Paris, 1888, ed. Marcel de Fréville.

de Mahieu by Matheolus of Picardy³ and *Le livre des manieres* of Estienne de Fougères.⁴ The work of Gilles li Muisis, in spite of its modern form, is neither comely nor such as to compel attention.⁵ Certain it is that his editor, M. Kervyn de Lettenhove, stands unenviably alone in comparing the abbot Gilles to Dante; at which juncture M. Langlois comes well to the rescue when he says of the Belgian cleric: *le bonhomme n'était pas bête*.

Finally, it might be urged that in a book of this character so many references to the technical journals of Romance philology only bewilder the layman and fall short of any purpose to instruct or edify him; nevertheless, it is much better to have included the material in question than to have omitted it, owing to the fact of its intrinsic value with the context. We hazard the wish that M. Langlois may see fit to construct an entire series of such works as the one in hand; they will—all of them—be the product of a rare talent in the sphere of general philology.

F. L. CRITCHLOW.

Princeton University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Das Fähnlein der sieben Aufrechten. Novelle von GOTTFRIED KELLER. Edited with Notes and a Vocabulary by W. G. HOWARD and A. M. STURTEVANT. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1907. Pp. iii + 170.

Keller's *Fähnlein der sieben Aufrechten* had long deserved a place among annotated school-texts, both for its intrinsic literary merit and its availability for class-use. The text as presented in the present edition is considerably abridged.

³Ed. A.-G. van Hamel, *Bibl. de l'École des Hautes-Études*, fasc. 95, 96. Paris, 1892-1905 (Erratum in Langlois reads: 1895.)

⁴Cf. J. Kremer's edition in *Ausg. und Abh.*, vol. xxxix, Marburg, 1887.

⁵Cf. *Poesies de Gilles li Muisis*, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. Louvain, 1882.

While this abridgment has in a measure impaired the broad epic style of the original, and through a change in connection occasionally strains the meaning of a word or phrase, the pruning has from a pedagogical point of view been done with skill and judgment. Two passages, the taking apart of Hediger's musket and Karl's reminiscences of an earlier kissing episode, one is, however, sorry to miss. The technical character of the former of these doubtless caused its elimination, but this objection could have been met by less drastic means, and the retention of the passage would have somewhat lessened the force of the otherwise just criticism (p. 87) that Karl "is perhaps a little too much of a paragon."

There was even less reason for the omission of the second episode. It is in Keller's best vein, with a delightful humorous turn, that banishes all suggestion of sentimentality, and with the whole raised to a higher poetical level by the inimitably graceful image of the butterfly that Karl in vain seeks to clutch.

The work of editing has on the whole been carefully done. An introductory sketch dealing with Keller's career and the setting of the story is modestly made to preface the Notes. In view of the popularity which this text is reasonably certain to enjoy the following criticism of details is perhaps in place.

Page 1, l. 15, "durfte sich sehen lassen" has an entirely different connotation from "was a sight for gods and men."—p. 2, l. 7. The statement that Schiller "expressed his obligation" to Müller in *Wilhelm Tell* is hardly correct, and is bound to be misunderstood.—p. 6, l. 16. *Bilder* are *Sternbilder*, constellations.—p. 8, l. 10. *hässlich* is not ugly, homely, but odious, detestable, 'hateful.'—p. 9, l. 10. *fromm* is not piously but gently, obediently.—p. 16, l. 15. In the expression "eine längere und fast schwierige Verhandlung" the difficulty lies not in *fast*, which the editors would interpret as used in the Swiss dialectic sense of *sehr*, but in *schwierig*, which is here applied to an abstract noun in a sense that is commonly restricted to individuals, i. e., *troublesome*, *vexatious*. *schwierig* with somewhat unusual shades of meaning is in fact a favorite word in Keller as the following quotations, all from *Martin Salander*, will show: "Die armen Würmer!"

dachte der Vater wiederum, "das ist eine schwierige Geschichte" (p. 111). "Du siehst, ich war auch beschäftigt; ich bin ein armer Teufel und habe stets mit dem Vermögen meiner Frau zu schaffen, es ist eine etwas schwierige Gegend dort hinten!" (p. 249). Unter diesen trieben sich die Einberuher umher, hier und da Rücksprache nehmend oder einen der schwierigeren Kannengiesser bearbeitend (p. 129).—p. 19, l. 10. The dative construction with *rufen* deserved a note.—p. 27, l. 10. The editors failed to observe the unusual construction of *während* with the dative. The Vocabulary gives it as governing the genitive only.—p. 27, l. 21. *steifen* is probably not *stiff*, *obstinate*, but *pedantic*, *formal*, *stiff*.—p. 31, l. 22. The reference in the Notes to p. 4, l. 22, does not explain the omission of the auxiliary.—p. 37, l. 16. In "als . . . Hermine hinter einer blühenden Weide hervortrat, die ganz voll gelber Kätzchen hing," *Weide* has strangely been taken to mean *pasture* instead of *willow*.—p. 40, l. 22. In "Allein sei es, . . . er blieb," the word-order is entirely regular.—p. 41, l. 27. *Spezialwaffe* refers not to the 'special branch of the service, special corps,' but to the *Stutzen* as the distinctive weapon of the special corps.—p. 51, l. 1. *Zöpfe* requires a note. "Jetzt sind die Demokraten oben und gelten für schneidig; die Altliberalen werden schon von ihnen Zöpfe genannt," remarks a character in *Martin Salander*. Similarly, "Prosit Anstrich, Herr Altliberaler, vulgo Zopfius!"—p. 53, ll. 11-14. The passage requires comment. Thus *Verdummung* (Vocabulary, 'stupification, brutalization, oppression'), which contains in it the fling that the Catholic party stands in the way of the enlightenment of the masses, remains entirely unintelligible in the light of either the Vocabulary or the statement on pp. 86-87.—p. 59, l. 10. The "gentlemen in black" are not "clergymen" (Vocabulary under *schwarz*) but the gentlemen of the receiving committee. Compare the references p. 61, ll. 4-7, and p. 63, l. 25.—p. 61, l. 15. The position of *lacht* calls for comment.—p. 80, l. 15. *weil* is *so long as* not *because*.—p. 120. *Fort-schrittsmann* is used in a technical sense and is *progressist* rather than *progressive man*.—p. 123. *geistig* also occurs in the sense of *intellectual* in the story.

Words omitted in the Vocabulary are: *rein* (p. 22, l. 3), *wohlgetan* (p. 58, l. 12), *taktfest* (p. 58, l. 25), *schenken* (p. 62, l. 1), *Schar* (p. 76, l. 24). The following misprints have been noticed: *alsbalb*, p. 18, l. 7.—last words of ll. 6-7, p. 56.—p. 95. Read "Page 64.—1. geblieben" for "2. geblieben."—p. 106, *whispers* for *whiskers*.

B. J. Vos.

Indiana University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF FRENCH LITERATURE.

Guide bibliographique de la littérature française de 1800 à 1905, par Hugo P. Thieme. Paris: Welter, 1907.

Professor Hugo P. Thieme's little bibliography of French literature in the nineteenth century, originally published in 1897 and itself a useful manual, now appears ten years later in a rich volume of over five hundred pages, enlarged and improved in every sense. Not only has the list of authors increased, but the brief sections on special topics, such as the drama, versification, etc., which contained a few entries each, have grown to an independent second part of about sixty pages. As it now stands Professor Thieme's volume will be an important addition to the working library of the teacher and advanced student and will many a time save the trouble of consulting the more unwieldy and expensive bibliographies. Its value is enhanced by the comprehensive sections devoted to the chief criticisms found in separate volumes, in collections of essays or in periodicals. Thus a large amount of otherwise rather perishable material is made accessible. The list includes a thorough survey of the important English and American as well as continental journals. The periodicals classified form a list of three and a-half pages comprising, Professor Thieme tells us, one hundred and seventy reviews completely indexed, and one hundred and two partly so. The list

of authors themselves is of about eight hundred and fifty names.

It seems ungracious to welcome the advent of a publication the result of such patience and industry by seeking defects, and it is to be hoped that the following comments may be considered merely as suggestions should Professor Thieme feel inclined at the end of another decade to give us a still bigger work, or a development of the second part:

The choice of authors is judicious and, for the earlier part of the nineteenth century comprises almost every one of modern interest. Indeed, one is a little startled to realize that the Abbé Siéyès and Volney are admissible to the list. As we reach contemporary writers, though individual tastes are bound to differ, there is room for query concerning certain omissions. Where are the chief writers who have come forward, let us say between 1900 and 1905, and concerning whom the reader might be the most anxious for information? There is no allusion to the novelists of provincial life Eugène Leroy, already dead, whose *Jacquou le croquant* is so much admired by good judges; Émile Guillaumin, author of the *Vie d'un simple*; Jean Revel (Paul Toutain) whose Norman stories won him some votes at a recent election to the Academy. This is a case where we do miss the "curious anomaly the lady-novelist" now elbowing her way to the front: Mme. Marcelle Tinayre, Mme. Myriam Harry (Mme. Perrault) author of *la Conquête de Jérusalem*, the Comtesse de Noailles, Pierre de Coulevain (Mlle. Favre). They are as worthy of record as Rachilde who appears. We look in vain for the dramatists Henry Bernstein, Francis de Croisset, and if Courteline and Gandillot are admitted, why leave out Tristan Bernard? None of the Goncourt prize-winners, even L. Frapié, are given, and to go a little more afield, if we have Xavier de Montépin and Émile Richebourg where is Alexis Bouvier? Finally, where is Alphonse Allais, during his life the most whimsical and popular of all French humorists?

Professor Thieme has not undertaken to account for all the political writers and journalists. But if MM. Bourgeois, Clemenceau and

Paul Deschanel are admitted why not M. Combes, who began life as a writer on theology? Was it impossible to find Challemel-Lacour's full name? If Rochefort and the pseudo-Frenchman Blowitz come in, where is Armand Carrel? And M. de Blowitz's successor as Paris correspondent of the *Times*, the American W. M. Fullerton might complain of neglect, inasmuch as his French writings have been rewarded by the Academy.

There is inconsistency and incompleteness in the names of authors, their pseudonyms, their *prénoms*. The publications of Théophile and Frantz Funck-Brentano are confused; a work by Pierre Leroy-Beaulieu (*Les États-Unis au XX^e siècle*), is credited to Paul L.-B., and Faguet's article on *Les trois Anti* refers to Anatole L.-B.; Jean Rameau is a pseudonym; Émile Gebhart did not die in 1904, but on the other hand became an Immortal in that year by entering the Academy; Quesnay de Beaurepaire's writing in connection with the Panama and Dreyfus affairs are more notorious than his novels written as Jules de Glouvet; Mme. Darmesteter (A. Mary F. Robinson) is now Mme. Duclaux and has published under that name; the reference under Saint-Simon to "Saint-Simon et Chavigny" refers to the author of memoirs and not to the nineteenth century writer.

There is inconsistency in recording reissues: sometimes the new dates follow upon the same line, sometimes they are recorded in chronological order below; for an example cf. Marcel Prévost. There is inconsistency and incompleteness in preparing names and titles in the references to books and periodicals. In a French indication the last name alone is less unnatural than with English authors. A few misprints are here noted: Du Camps for Du Camp (p. 56); Van Daehl for Van Daell (p. 59); O'rell for O'Rell (p. 60); Houssonville for Haussonville (p. 80); Clarletie for Claretie (p. 130); Guita for Guaita (pp. 158, 350, 503); Gourcoff for Gourcuff (p. 203); Bywanck (p. 206) and Byvank (p. 261) for Byvanck and Bijvanck ("Quelle muse oserait approcher des bords du Zuiderzée!"); Rozières for Rosières (under *périodiques*, p. 192); Bevers for van

Bever (p. 193); Alais for Allais (p. 207); Pière Lacordaire (p. 224); St-Beuve (p. 229); Beaumier for Beaunier (p. 257); Wyzewa Th. (p. 261 and *passim*) for Wyzewa T. (Teodor de); Preston Harriet and Harriett (p. 287) for Harriet; Estherhazy for Esterhazy (p. 336), where also the dates of Reinach's *Hist. de l'Affaire Dreyfus* should be 1901, 1903, 1903, 1904, 1905; Hugs for Hugo (p. 369); De Amicio for De Amicis (p. 373); Pachen for Pacheu (p. 424); H. Sherard for R. H. Sherard (p. 442); B. N. Wells for B. W. Wells (p. 444); Sedgwich for Sedgwick (p. 486); P. Martin for B. Martin (p. 496); Goss for Gosse (p. 503). The volume testifies to its exotic printing place (Weimar) by the grave accent rakishly cocked upon the capital A (Â) like the cap on an English Tommy Atkins, though the author is not consistent in its use even on his title page, and by a confusion between I, Y and J: Edmund Yates, the English journalist becomes Jates (p. 200); Yetta Blaze de Bury is Jetta (p. 40) and, on the other hand, the *Iambes* of Barbier become the *Jambes de Barbier* (p. 55), which reminds one of the derivation of *Jambus* in the prologue to Rabelais's Book II.

The second part, on works to be consulted in connection with the history of the French language, literature and civilization, although an afterthought, will prove a very useful portion of the book and might well be developed into an independent volume. As it stands, it contains much miscellaneous material, which might bear sifting. One is not inclined to complain at the presence of many references to works concerning or dating from the period before 1800 back to the Middle Ages, but Thurneysen on the accentuation of old Irish verbs (p. 478) seems remote from French versification, and the Credit Mobilier (p. 496) means nothing nearer France than the American congressional scandal of that name. On the other hand one misses (*e. g.*, on p. 468) any reference to Nordau's *Entartung*, one of the important contributions to the study of the symbolists and decadents.

Such slips do not seriously detract from the great value of Professor Thieme's handbook

for the convenience of his colleagues and of students of French in general.

C. H. C. WRIGHT.

Harvard University.

THE DRAMA.

DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES.¹

As its author assures us in his preface, this work is not a history of the medieval drama, but an attempt "to hold a brief for one of the parties to a controversy which, in his opinion, has either been ignored or decided incorrectly, for nearly three-quarters of a millennium." In other words it is an effort to show that there was a continuous and popular drama written and acted in the Byzantine Empire throughout the middle ages and that this drama was the direct source not only of the medieval and Renaissance drama of Western Europe, but of all dramatic elements found in medieval literature, for "we may talk as much as we like about independent literary origins. The simple fact is that there has never been anything of the kind within the historical period."² The author claims no originality for this thesis, but acknowledges his debt to Constantine Sathas,³ whom he considers "a reformer in the history of the whole medieval period." Creizenach,⁴ Krumbacher,⁵ and Clotetta⁶ are quoted, chiefly to be combatted.

Mr. Tunison first takes up dramatic traditions connected with the war between the Greek church and the theatre, then the plays produced by that church through the influence of the

¹ By Joseph S. Tunison, Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, and London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1907, xviii + 350 pages.

² Page 333.

³ *Ἱστορικὸν Δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ Θεάτρου καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν*, Venice, 1878.

⁴ *Geschichte des Neuere Dramas*, Halle, 1893.

⁵ *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, II, in Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, Munich, 1897.

⁶ *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Halle, 1890-92.

stage. In the first of the four chapters into which the work is divided, called *Traditions Due to the War between Church and Theatre*, he expresses the opinion that the early persecutions of the Christians took on a dramatic form which produced the church's hostility to the theatre. Chrysostom's opposition to the stage and Arius's interest in it are especially accentuated. Some notice is taken of the action of the Council of Trullo regarding theatrical practices. Tunison believes that an ecclesiastical drama arose at Constantinople toward 500, that the Iconoclasts subsequently brought theatrical dancing and music into the churches and that actors were introduced there about 990, originating a festival that spread to Western Europe as the Feast of Fools. He concludes that "it is clear that Voltaire and those who followed him were right in deriving the ritual play and mystery from Constantinople."⁷

In his second chapter, *Dramatic Impulses in Religion*, Tunison continues his account of the Byzantine stage, treating the plays that were written for the church. He begins with the Apollinarii in the fourth century and comes down to the Renaissance, making no chronological distinction between this and the preceding chapter. There he dwelt on traditions connected with disputes between the church and the theatre; he now takes up church plays themselves. Some elements appear in this second chapter that seem out of place, for we wonder what Heraclius's subsidizing of dramatic interests,⁸ the distinction between ballet-dancers and mimes,⁹ and the encouragement given by Constantine Porphyrogenitus to guild-plays¹⁰ have to do with dramatic impulses in religion.

Chief among the plays he mentions is, of course, the *Christus Patiens*, which he dates in the fourth century, contrary to the opinion of Krumbacher¹¹ and other scholars, who place it in the eleventh or twelfth. He meets

their linguistic arguments chiefly with the reflection that the critics "are prejudiced against the possibility of giving the work an early date, for the reason that it affects the study of the religious drama in the West."¹²

Having satisfied himself that a popular drama flourished at Constantinople, Mr. Tunison turns to Western Europe in order to prove the Byzantine origin of the medieval drama, the second part of his thesis. He had stated in his first chapter¹³ that the tropes of the church service from which most authors derive the medieval drama were themselves of Byzantine origin, a theory which he would prove by the statement that "the whole nomenclature of the science used in the construction of tropes and sequences is against those who wish to leave the lay reader under the impression that these amplifications of the liturgy originated in the West of Europe." Now, at the beginning of his chapter on *Eastern Tradition and Western Development*, he declares that modern historians have been influenced by patriotism to ascribe the origin of the medieval drama to Germany, England, or France, as the case may be. But the Greek, Sathas, has shown without *parti pris* that its origin is really Greek.

Chief among the western followers of the Byzantine drama he places the German nun Hrotsvitha and believes, contrary to Creizenach's opinion,¹⁴ that her plays were acted. Admitting that she was influenced by Terence, he concludes that her work is really derived from Byzantine plays, because he believes her plots to be from the hagiography of the Greek church, and because the abbess of her nunnery was the daughter of a Greek princess. Her dramatic influence, moreover, may be considered great, if we remember that the *Faust* legend, which she treats, was not forgotten and that she was quoted by "all writers who made any pretense of classic learning."¹⁵

Other examples of Byzantine dramatic influence are contained in the "disputes" of the troubadours, the Snow-Boy story, such tales as the *Querolus*, *Geta*, *Babio*, *Sadius* and *Galo*, etc.

⁷ Page 61. Voltaire would have the mystery brought back by Crusaders, just as he suggests that their pilgrimages were responsible for the fish and cockles found on top of the Alps.

⁸ P. 102.

¹⁰ P. 116.

⁹ P. 114.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 746-749.

¹² P. 71, note.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 17 seq.

¹³ P. 45, note.

¹⁵ P. 183.

If any scholars conclude with Cloetta¹⁶ that there was no continuous dramatic tradition from ancient to medieval times from the fact that the idea of tragedy and comedy was lost in the middle ages, as is shown by a number of definitions and the use of these words as titles to such works as Dante's *Divine Comedy* and the Greek "tragedies" of Krates, Oenomaos, and Diogenes,¹⁷ these objectors are confronted with the argument that "the miscellaneous use of the words 'tragedy' and 'comedy' and their cognates proves nothing . . . A newspaper man uses words of this kind in remotely derivative senses almost daily, and yet, if called upon, he could usually give a fair definition of each of them as restricted to the stage. In fact, an experiment upon a man who writes theatrical notices daily showed that his first thought, upon being asked the meaning of the word "tragedy" was not of the staged piece, but of some or any sorrowful occurrence or narrative, and his definition of "comedy" answered almost word for word to the group of definitions gathered by Cloetta from the whole range of medieval literature; and yet the man has a thorough professional knowledge of the theatre, with absolutely no knowledge whatever of the authors whom Cloetta cites."¹⁸

Another argument in favor of an independent origin for the medieval drama is the fact that this drama first appeared in Switzerland, England, France, and Germany, while Italy, the country nearest Byzantium was the last to develop it. We are wrong, however, if we draw any conclusions from this fact, for "the Italians knew well that these ecclesiastical dramas were not an evolution of the ritual" and "looked askance at the newcomer, more than suspicious of its origin, while the northern nations admired it as the proper offspring of the church." Tunison cites nothing in proof of this assertion.

But Italy, so loath to accept the religious drama of Byzantium, atoned for its indiffer-

ence by the numerous secular borrowings enumerated by Tunison in his last chapter, *The Mediation of Italy*. Our author considers personification in the eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil with Bede's imitations of them, Seneca's influence on Lydgate and on the play *Gorboduc*. He makes a digression on the history of the Roman drama and another on the *Winter's Tale*, mentions the dramatic qualities of the *Canterbury Tales*, of the *Fables of Adolphus*, the *Alda* of William of Blois, and other works, tracing their sources as far as he can to the Byzantine drama. He brings his book to a close with a genealogical dramatic tree, the main trunk of which "was successively Hellenic, Roman, Hellenistic, Byzantine, Italian." From the Hellenistic period comes the Christian drama; from the Byzantine, the "ecclesiastical theatre, the Morality and the Mystery"; from the Italian, the Spanish and English; "from the Spanish, the French comedy; from the English, the German. Such would be approximately what a complete analysis of the history of the drama must show."¹⁹

Mr. Tunison's idea of presenting in a fairly popular form a work on the dramatic traditions of an interesting age deserves commendation. The volume is attractively bound and named. The phraseology of the chapter headings is original. The passages of fine writing, pedantry, and slang are not sufficiently numerous to destroy the reader's interest. There are a number of pleasant anecdotes, some stories of more than passing interest. Any general reader who desires to be entertained in an atmosphere of learning will do well to read the book. I commend it to him heartily, for to him it is addressed.

To the scholar, however, to the scientific student of literary history the work is valueless. The author's attitude is prejudiced to a degree. He is constantly striving to establish Byzantine influence, using to that end the machinery of exaggeration, confusion, and solemn repetition of statements not yet proved. He seldom quotes documents at first hand, derives his facts from Sathas almost without

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹⁷ These are romances. Cf. Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 647.

¹⁸ P. 124.

¹⁹ P. 334.

criticism, has no bibliography and most incomplete foot-notes. Again and again he makes statements without giving proof or authority.²⁰ His material is largely undigested, very badly arranged.

To reconstruct a continuous Byzantine drama he calls to his aid the plays which formed a decadent prolongation of the ancient classic stage, but which ceased to be represented by the seventh century, and adds to them the later book-dramas and school imitations of classic authors, plays that were, as far as we can tell, neither acted nor intended for representation. References to the hippodrome, to circus performances, mimes and pantomines are held to refer to a real drama. He fails to consider the changing conditions of the Byzantine world, the influence of the Barbarians on its culture. To fill in the period from the seventh to the ninth century, which Krumbacher²¹ describes as cutting straight through the stage output and separating the ancient drama from the medieval, he brings forward such academic plays as the *Adam of Ignatius* (717). But by going twice over the period from the fourth century to the Renaissance and by a careful avoidance of all but the fewest dates, he creates the impression upon the casual reader that plays were written at Constantinople throughout the middle ages. I do not mean that he is intentionally insincere, for he seems to believe firmly in his thesis. His lack of accuracy may be due to his adherence to Sathas's work, which is notoriously ill-arranged.²² But this is hardly an excuse, for if Tunison's volume had a scholarly *raison d'être*, it would lie in his bringing order into the confusion of Sathas's treatise, a thing that he cannot be said to have accomplished.

Nor do we find Tunison's efforts at establishing Byzantine influence in the West more successful than they were at proving the existence of a continuous stage at Constantinople. He knows little of the medieval drama and dismisses with a few brief notes the mass of

scholarship devoted to tracing its development out of the church liturgy. His mistaken attitude towards Hroswitha's dramas has been shown in the *Nation*.²³ As a further example of his inaccuracy I quote his statement that Celtes's edition in 1501 of Hroswitha's plays antedates "all non-religious dramas in the West, except the two tragedies of Mussato and perhaps a Spanish comedy"²⁴ (the *Celestina*). He has forgotten *Pathelin*, *Robin et Marion*, *Griselidis* and other secular dramas of the middle ages. In the same connection he states that the *Celestina*, "though written in 1499, was practically unknown till much later." As a matter of fact, 1499 is merely the date of the earliest extant edition of the work, which was probably written about 1483.²⁵ The large number of its editions in the leading European languages throughout the sixteenth century belie Tunison's statement regarding its fame.

But his great mistake is the constant insistence upon Byzantine influence. Had he left this alone and confined himself to the facts of dramatic history, he would have written a book of some value and of decided interest. As it is, the volume is devoted to proving an impossible thesis in a manner that may mislead the careless reader, but will deceive no special student. Scholars will not take it over-seriously. They will be rather inclined to congratulate Mr. Tunison on the courage with which he has unsuccessfully assailed so orthodox an opinion as that of the independent origin of the medieval drama. They will congratulate him, too, on his acquaintance with Byzantine dramatic traditions, which are so much better known by him than they were by the authors of medieval plays in Western Europe.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

²³ Especially in his statement that she derived her plots from Byzantine hagiography. *The Nation*, LXXXV, 287-288.

²⁴ P. 139.

²⁵ See Foulché-Delbosc in the *Revue Hispanique*, IX, 171-99.

²⁰ Cf., for example, pp. 6, 15, 38, 81, 102.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 646.

²² Cf. Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 647, note.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

GUSTAVO ADOLFO BECQUER, *Legends, Tales and Poems*, edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Ph. D. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1908.

Nothing but praise can be due to Professor Olmsted for his selections from the prose and poetical remains of the lamented Becquer. Those who have known and loved Becquer in the Spanish three volume edition of 1898, will rejoice that he has found in America such a sympathetic and painstaking editor.

Professor Olmsted has given in this edition far more than we are accustomed to find or to demand in Spanish text-books. If we are not mistaken, his life of Becquer contains more reliable information than was anywhere accessible heretofore; his notes on Spanish prosody are more detailed than any we know in English except Dr. Ford's remarks on the same subject in *A Spanish Anthology*; his literary and explanatory notes on the text betray a range of reading and an alertness of observation which make of this volume a model from the literary standpoint.

The fact is that we are here dealing with genuine artistic literature in a Spanish text-book for almost the first time. Whatever else may be said in favor of the novelists, dramatists and short-story writers whose works have been adopted in our schools, they do not appeal to us primarily as artists. Becquer is an artist and a poet. To have treated him with other than respect and appreciation would have been a sacrilege. We must congratulate the editor upon the consecration which he has brought to his task, and the publishers upon the perfection of the book as a model of typography.

The editor states in his Preface that the text may be used in first or second year work. We should suppose that the vocabulary was so large and the style so literary as to preclude its use in the first year. Many teachers will agree that "fondness for good literature should be stimulated from the very first," and will yet continue to use for elementary work texts which make less demand upon the intellectual

appreciation of the pupil. The constantly recurring notes on prosody will not interest undergraduates, if we know them. We may be wrong, but we hold that the literary appreciation of a given lyric is not a whit increased when we are told that "this poem is made up of alternate decasyllabic anapests and dodecasyllabic amphibrachs." That is indeed Greek and will remain such to those who use the book. On the other hand, we believe thoroughly in the editor's novel efforts to cultivate in the student the habit of making his own literary comparisons with other foreign authors. The notes, moreover, are very full on all matters dealing with the religion, history and geography of Spain. In some of them, stiff quotations from Baedeker and the *Century Dictionary* seem of exaggerated length, and we think the editor could himself have worded the note more concisely. The bare mention of a town or province does not call for a paragraph of history with dates and present population, though we confess to having read these notes with interest and profit. The statement that Palestine is "a territory in the southern part of Syria,—chief city Jerusalem" does not seem to leave much to the originality of the student. But perhaps Professor Olmsted, like others of us, has not yet sounded the depths of undergraduate ignorance! We have, however, no controversy to find with notes which contain so much information worth having, except with the note on the *trobadores* (p. 31) which is inaccurate. It cannot be said of the troubadours that "belief in the marvelous, and hence in fairies, likewise characterized these poets." It is likely Becquer meant nothing more in the text than "popular ballad singers."

This edition consists of ten of Becquer's prose tales dealing with the legends, traditions and art of the Spanish provinces, and of some thirty pages of lyric verse among the most appealing in Spanish literature. That the edition marks a great advance in scholarship and typography is certain. Teachers must decide for themselves whether the text with its prevailing use of literary and artistic words rather than of the words of everyday speech

is what they want for their classes. Where Spanish literature is taught *per se*, and by all lovers of careful editing, Professor Olmsted's work will be welcomed and admired.

A fairly careful reading of the entire text has revealed but the following dropped accents:

P. 40, l. 26, *agazapose* for *agazapóse*.

P. 57, l. 8, *que* for *qué*.

P. 103, l. 19, *esta* for *está*.

P. 110, l. 16, *magnifico* for *magnífico*.

WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT.

Harvard College.

FABLE LITERATURE.

SNAVELY, G. E. : *Æsopic Fables in the Miroir Historial of Jehan de Vignay*. Baltimore : J. H. Furst Company, 1908. Johns Hopkins Diss.

This dissertation is only a portion of a more important work, a critical text of twenty-nine Æsopic fables taken from Jehan de Vignay's translation into Old French of Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale*. The dissertation as at present published comprises a biographical notice, an account of the translator's literary work, the influence of his writings upon English literature, the Latin source of the fables, and a description of the manuscripts.

Jehan de Vignay, that "industrious translator and very mediocre writer," as he is characterized by Paul Meyer, has received scant attention from the historians of literature. Most content themselves with the mere mention of his name and of a few of his works. Few facts concerning his life are known; but meager as these are, they have never before been fully brought together. The best previous account of Jehan de Vignay is that offered by Paul Meyer,¹ who says of this translator: "*moins heureux que Nicole Oresme ou que Pierre Bessuire, qu'il a précédés, il attend encore sa biographie, qui pourtant offrirait une matière assez neuve à des recherches intéressantes.*" Mr.

Snavely, although he has collected more biographical facts than any one of his predecessors, has failed to give us anything like the definitive biography for which M. Meyer longs. Mr. Snavely has doubtless gleaned all that one can readily find in the way of biographical data from Jehan de Vignay's own works, but as these consist mostly of translations they naturally afford little information. It is probable that only diligent search among the archives will produce the material required.

The main facts that we know concerning Jehan de Vignay are these: He was born in Normandy near Bayeux, about 1275 according to Mr. Snavely's estimate. He belonged to the order of Saint Jacques du Hault Pas, and as early as 1298 was a professor at Dijon. In 1318 he was acquitted of a charge of murder. Later he seems to have filled an ecclesiastical position in Rouen, and he died in all probability in 1348. His connection with the house of Valois was very close. Most of his work was done at the command of Jeanne de Bourgogne and her husband Philippe VI.

Mr. Snavely, basing his opinion upon internal evidence, identifies this Jehan de Vignay with the like-named author of two Latin treatises: *Margarita Philosophiarum* and *Glossa in Doctrinale Alexandri de Villedieu*. Aside from these original works, Jehan de Vignay is the author of twelve translations, of which the most interesting are the *Miroir Historial* of Vincent de Beauvais, the *Chronique* of Robert Primat, the *Légende Doree* of Jacques de Varazze (Jacobus de Voragine), and *Le Livre des Eschez* of Jacques de Cessoles. The two last-mentioned works interest the student of English literature in that they were the originals of two of Caxton's well-known translations. Mr. Snavely discusses separately each of the translations, and also devotes a special chapter to the Caxton editions. In his preface he tells us that he has been able to list as many as 132 manuscripts of Jehan de Vignay, but unfortunately this list is not yet published. Throughout the dissertation there are constant references to an appendix to be published later with the text of the fables.

In a chapter devoted to sources we are told that Jehan de Vignay's fables are all taken from Vincent de Beauvais; but no attempt is made to trace

¹ *Les anciens traducteurs français de Végèce, Rom.*, vol. xxv. See especially pp. 406-408.

the sources of the latter. To do so would be to go beyond the scope of the present work. As a translator Jehan de Vignay sinned in being too literally faithful to his original and too false to the genius of his own tongue. However, his clumsy style did not prevent a vogue which extended through nearly three centuries.

The last chapter of the dissertation is devoted to a description of the nine manuscripts containing the fables. The relationship of the manuscripts is given in tabular form. In forming his critical text Mr. Snively will, of course, also use the Latin of Vincent de Beauvais.

To sum up, the present dissertation offers a clear and scholarly account of the life and works of a little-known author. Mr. Snively has his bibliography well in hand. The second installment of his work promises to offer more that is new than the first.²

²Since the publication of Mr. Snively's dissertation in May, 1908, I have come across the mention of what is probably a tenth manuscript of Jehan de Vignay's fables. L. Delisle, *Recherches sur la Librairie de Charles V*, Paris, H. Champion, 1907, Vol. II, p. *307, gives a note on a manuscript purchased by Mr. H. Yates Thompson, the well-known English book collector, on Dec. 15, 1906. This manuscript at one time belonged to the duc de Berry, and it contains the first thirteen books of Jehan de Vignay's *Miroir Historial*. A rather full description of this new manuscript may be found in *Book-Prices Current*, Vol. XXI, p. 301, where it is stated that it was bought by Mr. Quaritch for £1290.

It may be further noted that, according to L. Roth, *Die mittelalterlichen Sammlungen lateinischer Thierfabeln*, Philologus, Vol. I (1846), pp. 523-546 (see p. 526), Vincent de Beauvais quotes Romulus fables singly in various places in his works ("und an verschiedenen stellen zerstreut") in addition to the collection of twenty-nine such fables studied by Mr. Snively in Jehan de Vignay's translation. These fables can hardly be identical with the twelve fables cited by J. Jacobs, *History of the Æsopic Fable*, pp. 229-268, from the pseudo *Speculum Morale*. Hence it is probable that a careful reading of the Old-French author's entire text would have disclosed additional fables for investigation to Mr. Snively.

Finally, it should be stated that in the slight fire which occurred in the Library of the Johns Hopkins University on September 17, 1908, the greater part of the official draft of Mr. Snively's dissertation was destroyed.—GEORGE C. KEIDEL, October, 1908.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre. La vie et les ouvrages de Jean-Jacques Rousseau, édition critique publiée avec de nombreux fragments inédits, par MAURICE SOURIAU. Société des Textes français modernes. Paris: Publications de la Société de Librairie et d'Édition, 1907.

This volume, published as No. VII, by the *Société des Textes Français Modernes*, will render valuable services, especially coming at a time when Rousseau studies are so much in favor.

The text was so far available only in the edition of 1836, which was practically useless for scientific purposes. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre had been prevented by other occupations (see *Avant-Propos*, p. x) from completing his contemplated work on Rousseau, and only notes had been left, and very valuable notes, too. Aimé Martin decided to include them in the *Oeuvres posthumes*, but in order to make them more acceptable to the public, as he thought, he assumed the delicate task of writing out the book himself with the aid of the notes. He was not a competent person to do it as is well shown in Souriau's "Avant-Propos"; moreover, in itself, it was undesirable that such a work of rearrangement be undertaken at all. In the first place, the literary value would never be equal to that of *Bernardin de Saint-Pierre*; and from the scholarly point of view, that is, to have the book available for scientific purposes, the slightest alteration was still too much.

Let us give an instance: On page 60 (of the Souriau edition) we read that Rousseau had to depend for his living during his last stay in Paris, on 600 francs a year; whatever he needed more, —and he said that he needed altogether 1200 francs a year—he had to earn in copying music. But we know from another source that Rousseau had during this period a larger income which he actually received, but a smaller sum than even the 600 francs upon which he could absolutely depend (see: *Oeuvres*, Ed. Hachette, XII, pp. 243-4). Both pieces of information come directly from Rousseau, it would seem; but both cannot be true. Now, we know that B. de Saint-Pierre misstated some other facts which Rousseau had certainly told him correctly (*e. g.*, Rousseau never told him that he was born in 1708, or that his mother had brought him up); so, we know

that B. de Saint-Pierre cannot be entirely depended upon when he merely reports Rousseau's statements, and that, in case of disagreement with probable statements from other sources, we need not lay too much stress upon B. de Saint Pierre's. But this we did *not* know before, as Aimé Martin had carefully corrected errors similar to those mentioned before publishing his edition.

But leaving aside the question of edition, it is well that the book should be easily accessible now for a good many reasons :

It gives us the best, the most direct information regarding one of the periods of Rousseau's life which is most difficult to understand and to judge impartially. And there B. de Saint-Pierre speaks of facts which he has personally witnessed, and therefore he can be relied upon pretty well. *E. g.* his description of Rousseau's appearance, pp. 31-32 (Souriau edition); the description of his apartment, pp. 31 ss.; their excursions around Paris, pp. 236 ss.; the daily occupations of Rousseau, 49, etc.

It gives some interesting points of comparison with passages of the "Confessions" (which, of course, B. de Saint-Pierre did not know), *e. g.*: the hospice in Turin, p. 34; the Venice episode, pp. 44-5; the love episode in Turin, p. 94; the Misses Galley and Graffenried, p. 95; or anecdotes similar to those told in the "Rêveries," pp. 90-1.

It adds new information—and at places the new edition gives more than the one of Aimé Martin—*e. g.*: the Tante Suzon, pp. 38-39; Rousseau's father, p. 40; concerning the *Devin du Village*, pp. 63, 136; the financial situation of Rousseau, pp. 60, 61, 62, 63 (see what I said above regarding this point). And some opinions of Rousseau concerning men of his time: Voltaire, p. 10; Richardson, pp. 126, 129, 140; Hume, pp. 39-40, 64, 99; or books, like *Astrée*, p. 123.

The information regarding Rousseau's writings, and particularly *Emile*, is very important, pp. 37, 112, 161, 169-173. Rousseau wanted his friend to write a continuation of *Emile*, and, of course, explained to him in detail what he wanted; and from the point of view of Rousseau's development of ideas, the summary now published by Souriau we consider to be a capital document (most romanesque at the same time and bold is this second *Emile*; let us only say that Rousseau is not opposed to polygamy, as

Emile deliberately takes two wives like the patriarch Abraham).¹

I am not prepared to say that all these notes are fascinating reading. The criticism of Rousseau, the comparison of Rousseau and Voltaire offer pretty commonplace views (of course they were not so at the time of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre). Some of the remarks about Rousseau's character are not bad (pp. 73 ss.).

What has been said will suffice to give an idea of the book; we conclude by saying that no Rousseau library is complete without it.

The only thing that we really miss in this excellent book is an Index; a very easy thing to supply in a new edition.

A. SCHINZ.

Bryn Mawr College.

OLD ENGLISH HISTORY.

The Origin of the English Nation, by H. MUNRO CHADWICK, Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1907. (Cambridge Archæological and Ethnological Series.)

Mr. Chadwick is well-known as a learned and patient student of Anglo-Saxon and Germanic antiquities and a cautious, though vigorous antagonist of many of the older theories touching primitive life and institutions. His volume entitled *Studies in Anglo-Saxon Institutions*, published in 1905, was mainly directed toward the solution of some of the most obscure problems in early English history; the volume before us carries the subject back to the days of Anglo-Saxon settlement and thence to the Continent from the fifth to the second centuries. His method of investigation is that of working from the known to the unknown, already successfully utilized by Seebohm, Vinogradoff, Maitland, Round, and others in investigating English history before the twelfth century.

¹ Bernardin de Saint-Pierre declined the offer, and we learn from a letter of Le Bègue de Presle, shortly after the catastrophe of July, 1778, that Rousseau had decided to finish "Emile" himself. (See Musset Pathay's document on the question of the suicide in *Vie et ouvrages de J. J. Rousseau*, Vol. II.)

This work is composed of twelve essays, each in a sense separate in itself yet forming a part of a common plan. Through the majority of the essays one general purpose runs, to employ the evidence of philology, archæology, and folklore to the elucidating of the character of primitive tribal institutions. Though the main thread is often lost sight of in the midst of the many detailed archæological, mythological, and philological digressions, nevertheless its essential character remains clear. Primitive life was not democratic but monarchic and aristocratic; its leading institutional feature was not a tribal assembly upon which monarchy was dependent or by which it was limited, but a king surrounded by his warriors. Mr. Chadwick rejects Tacitus' account, as describing a people more advanced in civilization than were the Germanic tribes of the north, and he places his dependence upon the poems, traditions, and archæological remains rather than upon the statements of the Roman historian, whose *Germania*, he believes, does not present a normal tribal organization.

Mr. Chadwick at the same time searches for the home of the Angli and finds it in the regions at the base of the Danish peninsula bordering on the Baltic. He denies Bæda's contention that the Angli came to Britain as "leaderless hordes," and believes that the conquest was effected by kings and warriors, that is, by the military class, which dominated the tribe and controlled whatsoever of government was developed at that time. He denies to the peasants—the mass of the tribe—any important share in government or in fighting, and relegates them to a subordinate place as concerned only in agriculture and religious ceremonies. Similar conditions existed in Britain after the conquest, so that all prevailing notions as to the military origin of kingship on English soil are without foundation.

Lastly, Mr. Chadwick takes up the questions which Bæda raises in his *Historia* as to whether the Angli and the Saxons were two separate and distinct peoples. From a study of dialectal characteristics and other linguistic evidences, from tradition, and from known social peculiarities such as the system of wergelds and the like, he concludes that the invaders of Britain belonged not to three but to two dis-

tinct nationalities, which we may call Jutish and Anglo-Saxon. The former occupied Kent and southern Hampshire and the latter the rest of the conquered territory. The Anglo-Saxons may not have been originally a homogeneous people, but there is no evidence to show that any national difference survived when they invaded Britain. By alien peoples they were all called Saxons, but the names which they applied to themselves and their language were *Angelcyn* and *Englisc*.

With Mr. Chadwick's main contentions we heartily agree, though his evidence is often scanty and his foundations often slender. His processes are, however, always scholarly and his methods scientific, a statement that cannot be made of the manner in which the von Maurer-Freeman school reached its conclusions. The historical scholar will not always feel competent to judge as to the soundness of many of Mr. Chadwick's arguments, but he is certain to feel satisfied that Mr. Chadwick has presented the subject in a new light and has started the investigation in a right direction.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SOURCE OF VOLTAIRE'S *Phoenix*.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In matters of mere opinion, critics may be, for reasons of temperament or differing mental valuations, diametrically opposed to one another. In matters of fact, where a mathematical logic exists, there should be no basis for disagreement. The following references show how critics may differ even with the same material at hand. The danger in source-finding lies in unqualified assertion, where the data present to the senses is of doubtful character.

In Voltaire's *La Princesse de Babylone*, a phoenix plays an important part, ostensibly acting the rôle of a messenger of love; in reality, being the vehicle to express Voltaire's conception of the human soul.

Le Breton, in his *Roman au XVIII^e Siècle*

[Paris, 1898, p. 212], after some consideration of the sources of Voltaire's "romans," makes the unqualified statement regarding the phoenix that; "Il [Voltaire] n'a guère imité, du reste, les Mille et une Nuits, et les Mille et un jours, qu'à travers les conteurs de son siècle: ce phénix qui sert de Mentor à la Princesse, il l'a pris dans le petit volume du Chevalier de Mailly que j'ai déjà cité . . ."

This "petit volume" entitled *Voyages et Aventures des Trois Princes de Sarendip*, while doubtless responsible for incidents in *Zadig*, cannot, with the greatest effort of the imagination, be considered the source of Voltaire's phoenix. There is, indeed, in this collection of pseudo-oriental adventures, a tale dealing with metempsychosis, in which a sparrow and a parrot take part, but this may be rejected at once, as bearing not the slightest resemblance to the story of the phoenix. Further than this there is, in the volume, nothing to suggest, even faintly, the mystic bird of Arabia.

John Dunlop, in his *History of Fiction* [London, 1845, p. 374], found an entirely new and equally absurd source. "Another of Voltaire's novels, *La Princesse de Babylone*, has been suggested by a French tale entitled *Le Parisien et la Princesse de Babylone* inserted in *La Nouvelle Fabrique des excellens Traits de Verités par Philippe d'Alcriste* [an anagram for Le Picard]. . . . In his tale, the beautiful princess of Babylone has a disgusting and unwelcome suitor in the person of the Sophi of Persia. The son of a French jeweler hearing of her beauty, sends her an amatory epistle by means of a swallow, and receives a favorable answer by a similar conveyance; and this bird, which corresponds to Voltaire's phoenix, becomes the friend and confidant of the lovers."

The resemblance of this tale to Voltaire's is of the slightest description and should give no encouragement to a critic to suggest a possible connection. The tale of d'Alcriste is a bit of oriental love-making. Voltaire's "conte," for all its wealth of descriptive detail, is primarily a vehicle for presenting certain philosophical ideas. Rather than postulate such sources for the phoenix, it is simpler and wiser

to grant Voltaire's originality in this case, at least until some probable source is discovered. The phoenix and its peculiar habits were well known to antiquity and the Middle Ages. Voltaire needed no enlightenment on a subject discussed by Herodotus, Pliny, and Tacitus.

Voltaire was not concerned with the antics of the phoenix; its fabulous powers of death and resurrection were what interested him, engaged as he was on a metaphysical problem. The mystic qualities of the phoenix typified the divine forces of the human soul, and these Voltaire was intent upon showing. It is reasonable to suppose that the phoenix was no borrowing from French fiction, but a stock figure brought forth from the store of the memory to serve as a concrete example of an abstract idea.

SHIRLEY GALE PATTERSON.

Cornell University.

NOTE ON TURKISH PLAYS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In *Schejtan Dolaby*, one of the *Karagöz* comedies, there is a parallel to Jaques' familiar speech in *As You Like It*, II, 7, 139,

All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players:

Hadgievad, an actor in the Turkish play, makes his entrance singing a song, from which the following extract is taken. (Jacob, *Karagöz-Komödien*, 2. Heft, Berlin, 1899.)

Mit Aufmerksamkeit betrachte dieses Himmelsgewölbe,
Diese Welt ist dem Schatten ähnlich für Kenner.
Äusserlich gesehen ist es (das Schattenspiel) ein Vorhang
Aber es ist eine Allegorie auf die Welt.
Wähne nicht, dieser Vorhang bestehe lediglich aus Schattenbildern.

Wenn man ihn in Wahrheit betrachtet, ist er der Platz
lehrreichen Exempels.

Die zeitlichen Vorgänge zeigt der Vorhang,
Was alles gekommen und vorüberzogen ist am Ahn.
Ausserhalb dieser Welt ist für Niemanden Bestand,
Ohne Dauer hat geschaffen die Majestät, welche man um
Beistand anfleht (d. i. Gott).

Alle, die kommen, gehen wieder, bis die Vernichtung
eintritt.

Im hajal (Schatten?) sind hajal die geschauten Gegenstände.

The Turkish *Karagöz* comedies are shadow plays, or, more correctly, silhouette plays. The apparatus consists of a canvas screen, back of which is placed a lighted olive oil lamp. The figures are made of leather, and are attached to a slender rod. The shadowplayer sits back of the lamp and manipulates the figures by pressing them against the screen with his rod. The screen, translated here by the word *Vorhang*, corresponds, therefore, to the stage; and the *Schatten*, really silhouettes, to the action of the players. The words which are translated in lines 5 and 6 as *Vorhang*, and *Platz lehrreichen Exempels* are, in Turkish, similar in sound, thus bringing out the more forcibly the idea of the stage presenting a picture of human life.

GRACE FLEMING SWEARINGEN.

Olivet College.

AN ANALOGY BETWEEN THE *Golden Legend* AND AN OLD IRISH POEM.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—That the modern scholar, in seeking the sources of literary works, is apt to over-emphasize mere coincidences is a well-known fact. Because a poet may happen to have a thought that has already been expressed before, it does not follow that he has borrowed it from his predecessor. The thesis of many a doctoral dissertation might be controverted, if we were able to devise some method by which these mere parallelisms could be detected. An interesting example of such a coincidence is the following:

In Longfellow's *Golden Legend*, there is a description of the scriptorium of the convent of Hirschau in the Black Forest. Friar Pacificus is transcribing and illuminating a volume; and as he completes his day's work, he looks through the window and exclaims:

"How sweet the air is! How fair the scene!
I wish I had as lovely a green
To paint my landscapes and my leaves!
How the swallows twitter under the eaves!
There, now, there is one in her nest;
I can just catch a glimpse of her head and breast,
And will sketch her thus in her quiet nook,
For the margin of my Gospel book."¹

In 1853, Zeuss published in his celebrated *Grammatica Celtica*,² three Old Irish verses that

were found scattered in the manuscript of the St. Gall Priscian, which dates from the middle of the ninth century. These verses express the moods of the glossator as he struggles with the obscurities of the Latin text. The second one, which occurs on pp. 203-4 of the manuscript, bears a striking resemblance, both as regards situation and sentiment, to the lines cited above. I append a translation of the three verses, which, I may add, differs but slightly from that of Whitley Stokes:³

I.

Bitter is the wind to-night: it shakes the ocean's white locks:

I fear not the coursing of a clear sea by the fierce warriors of Lothlind (Norway).

II.

A hedge of trees surrounds me: a blackbird's lay sings to me—a praise that I do not hide.

Above my booklet the lined one, the twittering of the birds sings to me.

In a brown robe, the cuckoo's beautiful clear song sings to me from the tops of the bushes.

May the good Lord protect me from Doom! I write well under the greenwood.

III.

Take thy corner in the prison: thou shalt reach neither pillow nor pallet:

Sad is that, as the servant of the rods, the pack-saddle of ill-luck has stuck to thee.

Now, the *Golden Legend* was already copyrighted in 1851, or two years before the appearance of the *Grammatica Celtica*, in which the Irish verses were published for the first time.⁴

JOHN L. GERIG.

Columbia University.

³ Stokes and Strachan, *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*, vol. II, p. 290.

⁴ An interesting example of the same kind appeared in *Le Figaro* of Sept. 10, 1907. M. Georges Thiébaud had noted a striking analogy between the *Vase brisé* of Sully-Prudhomme and a passage of *L'Homme qui rit* (tome I, p. 434 of the *ne varietur* edition) which was thus conceived:

"Il arrive parfois que, sans qu'on sache comment, parce qu'il a reçu le choc obscur d'une parole en l'air, un cœur se vide insensiblement. L'être qui aime s'aperçoit d'une baisse dans son bonheur. Rien de redoutable comme cette exsudation lente de vase fêlé."

This passage was communicated to Sully-Prudhomme who replied, in a letter dated from Châtenay (Seine), the 2nd of Sept., 1907 (two days before his death), as follows: " . . . La coïncidence que vous me signalez ne me surprend pas moins que vous. Simple coïncidence, en effet, car mon petit poème le *Vase brisé* a paru en 1865 chez le libraire-éditeur Alphonse Lemerre dans mon premier volume, intitulé *Stances et Poèmes*, et il était composé depuis plus d'un an déjà. Il est donc antérieur au roman d'Hugo, *L'Homme qui rit*. Il est plus que probable qu'Hugo n'avait pas eu connaissance de mon *Vase brisé*: il y a donc une rencontre bien extraordinaire de nos deux pensées dans le passage que vous me citez. J'en suis fier, grâce à vous. . . ."

L'Homme qui rit was written from July, 1866, to August, 1868, and was published in 1869.

¹ P. 177 of the 1853 edition.

² Zeuss-Ebel, *Gram. Celt.*, 1877, 2nd ed., pp. 953-4.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

MANAGING EDITOR :
A. MARSHALL ELLIOTT.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS :
JAMES W. BRIGHT. HERMANN COLLITZ.

EIGHT NUMBERS A YEAR.

BALTIMORE, MD.

SINGLE COPY (CURRENT
TWENTY-FIVE CENTS.

ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER AT THE BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, POSTOFFICE.

CONTENTS.

THOMPSON, ELBERT N. S.—CONCERNING <i>The Four Daughters of God</i> , - - - - -	233-234
CRAWFORD, J. WICKERSHAM.—A LETTER FROM MEDINILLA TO LOPE DE VEGA, - - - - -	234-238
PRIEST, GEO. M.—A NOTE TO KORNER'S <i>Leier und Schwert</i> , - - - - -	238-239
TINKER, CHAUNCEY B.—NOTES ON <i>Beowulf</i> , - - - - -	239-240
LESTER, JOHN A.—ITALIAN ACTORS IN SCOTLAND, - - - - -	240-242
SETZLER, E. B.—WHY NOT A FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE? - - - - -	243-244
EGGE, ALBERT E.—A NOTE ON SHAKESPEARE, - - - - -	244-245
SHERMAN, STUART P.—A NEW PLAY BY JOHN FORD, - - - - -	245-249
<i>Reviews:—</i>	
LANGLOIS, CH.-V.—LA VIE EN FRANCE AU MOYEN ÂGE. [F. L. Critchlow.] - - - - -	249-251
KELLER, GOTTFRIED.—DAS FÄHNLEIN DER SIEBEN AUFRECHTEN, EDITED BY W. G. HOWARD AND A. M. STURTEVANT. [B. J. Vos.] - - - - -	251-252
THIEME, HUGO P.—GUIDE BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE DE LA LITTÉRATURE FRANÇAISE DE 1800 À 1905. [C. H. C. Wright.] - - - - -	252-254

Reviews—continued:

TUNISON, JOSEPH S.—DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES. [H. Carrington Lancaster.] - - - - -	254-257
BECQUER, GUSTAVO ADOLFO.—LEGENDS, ETC., EDITED BY EVERETT WARD OLMSTED. [Wm. Wistar Comfort.] - - - - -	258-259
SNARELY, G. E.—ÆSOPIC FABLES IN THE MIREOIR HISTORIAL OF JEHAN DE VIGNAY. [George T. Northup.] - - - - -	259-260
SOURIAU, MAURICE.—BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE, LA VIE ET LES OUVRAGES DE JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU. [A. Schinz.] - - - - -	260-261
CHADWICK, H. MUNRO.—THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH NATION. [Chas. M. Andrews.] - - - - -	261-262

Correspondence:—

PATTERSON, SHIRLEY GALE.—SOURCE OF VOLTAIRE'S <i>Phœnix</i> , - - - - -	262-263
SWEARINGEN, GRACE FLEMING.—NOTE ON TURKISH PLAYS - - - - -	263-264
GERIG, JOHN L.—AN ANALOGY BETWEEN THE <i>Golden Legend</i> AND AN OLD IRISH POEM, - - - - -	264

THE LATEST FRENCH TEXTS

IN THE

International Modern Language Series

HENNING'S POLYEUCTE MARTYR

A stirring play representing the full maturity of Corneille's genius.

LAZARE'S LES PLUS JOLIS CONTES DE FÉES

The best fairy tales edited in the simplest way for beginners.

DE MAISTRE'S LES PRISONNIERS DU CAUCASE

A true and thrilling account of the adventures of a young Russian officer.

ROTRON'S SAINT GENEST AND VENCESLAS

Two tragedies by Corneille's greatest contemporary never before published outside of France.

GINN & COMPANY Publishers

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO LONDON

NEW MODERN LANGUAGE TEXTS

Healy's *La Comédie Classique en France* 50 cents
By EDITH HEALY. Cloth. 16mo. 283 pages, with vocabulary.

Schiller's *Ballads and Lyrics* (Selections) 60 cents
Edited by LEWIS A. RHOADES, Ph. D., Professor of German, Ohio State University. Cloth. 16mo. 270 pages, with notes, exercises and vocabulary.

Johnson's *Cuentos Modernos* 60 cents
Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by ALBERT BUSHNELL JOHNSON, A. M., Associate Professor of the Romance Languages in Brown University. Cloth. 16mo. 251 pages.

Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea* 60 cents
Edited by WATERMAN T. HEWETT, Ph. D., Professor of the German Language and Literature, Cornell University. Cloth. 16mo. 325 pages, with notes and vocabulary.

Avellaneda's *Baltasar* 65 cents
Edited by CARLOS BRANSBY, Litt. D., Instructor in the Spanish Language and Literature, University of California. Cloth. 16mo. 224 pages, with notes and vocabulary.

Heyse's *Er Soll Dein Herr Sein* 30 cents
Edited by MARTIN H. HAERTTEL, Ph. D., Instructor in German, University of Wisconsin. Cloth. 16mo. 106 pages, with notes, exercises, and vocabulary.

Turrell's *Spanish Reader* 80 cents
By CHARLES ALFRED TURRELL, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages, University of Arizona. Cloth. 16mo. 256 pages, with vocabulary.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION

(With intermission from July to October inclusive)

Devoted to the Interests of the Academic Study of English, German, and the Romance Languages.

ALL SUBSCRIPTIONS PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$1.50 PER ANNUM

For the United States and Canada; for all Foreign Countries included in the Postal Union, \$1.75

Published by the Managing Editor, A. M. ELLIOTT, Baltimore.

Contributors and Publishers will please send all matter intended for the English department of the NOTES to Professor James W. Bright; for the German department, to Professor Hermann Collitz; for all other departments, to Professor A. Marshall Elliott. The address of each editor is: Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

Ackermann, Richard.—Percy B. Shelley: *Prometheus Unbound*, a lyrical drama in four acts. Erste Kritische Textausgabe, mit Einleitung und Kommentar. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1908.

Baker, Franklin T., and H. V. Abbott.—English Composition. New York: H. Holt & Co., 1908.

Baldwin, Edward Chauncey, and Harry C. Paul.—English Poems. New York: American Book Company, 1908.

Blakely, Gilbert Sykes.—Teachers' Outlines for Studies in English, based on the requirements for admission to College. New York: American Book Company, 1908.

Boas, Frederick S.—Giles and Phineas Fletcher: Poetical Works. Vol. I. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.

Cobb, Palmer.—The Influence of E. T. A. Hoffmann on the Tales of Edgar Allan Poe. Chapel Hill, N. C.: The University Press, 1908.

Coulton, G. G.—Chaucer and his England. With thirty-two illustrations. London: Methuen & Co., 1908.

Cunliffe, John W.—George Gascoigne: The Posies. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.

Dobell, Bertram.—Centuries of Meditations by Thomas Traherne (1636?-1674). Now first printed from the author's manuscript. London: Bertram Dobell, 1908.

Frisa, Heinrich.—Deutsche Kulturverhältnisse in der Auffassung W. M. Thackerays. [Wiener Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, xxvii.] Wien u. Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1908.

Furnivall, F. J., and John Munro.—Life and Work of Shakespeare. London: Cassell & Co., 1908.

Gasquet, F. A., and Edmund Bishop.—The Bosworth Psalter: an account of a manuscript formerly belonging to O. Turville-Petre, Esq., of Bosworth Hall, now Addit. MS. 37517 at the British Museum. London: George Bell & Sons, 1908.

Gildersleeve, Virginia Crocheron.—Government Regulation of the Elizabethan Drama. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908.

Guthkelch, A.—The Battle of the Books, by Jonathan Swift; with selections from the literature of the Phalaris controversy. London: Chatto and Windus, 1908.

Hammond, Eleanor Prescott.—Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Harvey-Jellie, W.—Les Sources du Théâtre Anglais à l'Époque de la Restauration. Diss. Paris: Université de Paris, 1906.

Haskell, Juliana.—Bayard Taylor's Translation of Goethe's *Faust*. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908.

Hinchman, W. S., and F. B. Gummere.—Lives of Great English Writers from Chaucer to Browning. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908.

Hodell, Charles W.—The Old Yellow Book, source of Browning's *The Ring and The Book*, in complete photo-reproduction, with translation, essay, and notes. Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1908.

Hood, Loring Holmes.—A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies. [Yale Studies in English.] New York: H. Holt & Co., 1908.

Jewett, Sophie.—The Pearl, a Middle English Poem. A modern version in the metre of the original. New York: Thos. Y. Crowell & Co., 1908.

Klump, Wilhelm.—Die altenglischen Handwerkernamen sachlich und sprachlich erläutert. [Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 24.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1908.

Leonard, M. H.—Grammar and Its Reasons. New York: A. S. Barnes & Co., 1908.

Lienemann, K.—Die Belesenheit von William Wordsworth. Kapitel I. Englische Litteratur bis Dryden. Diss. Berlin: 1908.

Lounsbury, T. R.—The Standard of Usage in English. New York: Harper Bros., 1908.

MacCracken, Henry Noble.—Quixley's Ballades Royal (? 1402). Reprinted from the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, xx, 33-50.

Mackaye, Percy.—Mater: an American Study in Comedy. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1908.

Malone Society Reprints.—(1) The History of King Leir 1605. (2) Collections. Oxford: University Press, 1907.

Metzger, Ernst.—Zur Betonung der lateinisch-romanischen Wörter im Neuenglischen, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zeit von ca. 1561 bis cir. 1660. [Anglistische Forschungen. Heft 25.] Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1908.

Moffat, Douglas M.—The Complaint of Nature, by Alain de Lille. Translated from the Latin. [Yale Studies in English, xxxvi.] New York: H. Holt & Co., 1908.

Moffatt, James Hugh.—Shakespeare's Tragedy of *King Richard II*, edited with notes and an introduction. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.

Moorman, Fred. W., and H. P. Junker.—Shakespeare: *Macbeth*. Edited, with Notes. In two parts. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1908.

Munro, John J.—Brooke's 'Romeus and Juliet,' being the original of Shakespeare's 'Romeo and Juliet,' newly edited. London: Chatto and Windus, 1908.

Napier, A. S.—An Old English Vision of Leofric, Earl of Mercia. Reprinted from the Philological Society's Transactions, 1908.

Orr, S.—Life and Letters of Robert Browning. [Revised Edition.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908.

Owen, Edward T.—Hybrid Parts of Speech. A development of this proposition: In a single sentence a word may operate, though unrepented, as different parts of speech. Reprinted from the *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, vol. xvi.

Page, Curtis Hidden.—Molière. A new translation, the Verse Plays being for the first time rendered into English verse. With an Introduction by Brander Matthews. Two vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

Poscher, Robert.—Andrew Marvell's Poetische Werke. [Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, xxviii.] Wien und Leipzig: W. Braumüller, 1908.

Rickert, Edith.—The Romance of Emaré. Early English Text Society, Extra Series, xcix. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1906.

Remy, A.—Spanish Composition, compiled and edited with notes and vocabulary. *Boston*: Heath & Co., 1908. 12mo., iv and 98 pp.

Rey de Artieda, A.—Los amantes, tragedia original, precedida de una noticia biográfica y bibliográfica del autor, por Francisco Martí Grajales; publicala nuevamente Francisco Carreres Vallo. *Valencia*: Manuel Pan, 1908. 4to., xlv + 83 pp.

Sanz del Castillo, A.—La mogiganga del gusto en seis novelas, publicadas con una introducción por D. Emilio Cotarelo y Morí. (Colección de antiguas novelas españolas. Tomo VIII.) *Madrid*: Imp. Ibérica, 1908. 8vo., xii + 369 pp., 3 pes.

Tamayo y Baus.—Lo Positivo. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by Philip Harry and Alfonso de Salvo. *Boston*: Heath & Co., 1908. 12mo., viii + 124 pp., 75 cents.

Tirso de Molina.—Comedias, tomo II. Colección ordenada é ilustrada por D. Emilio Cotarelo y Morí. (*Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*.) *Madrid*: Bailly-Baillière, 1907. 8vo., xlv + 746 pp. 12 pes.

Turrell, C. A.—A Spanish Reader for Beginners in High Schools and Colleges. *New York*: American Book Co., 1908. 12mo., 256 pp.

Valera, J.—Pepita Jiménez. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by C. L. Lincoln. *Boston*: Heath & Co., 12mo., xii + 286 pp.

Zauner, A.—Altspanisches Elementarbuch. (Sammlung Romanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, herausgegeben von W. Meyer-Lübke.) *Heidelberg*: Carl Winter, 1908. 8vo., xii + 190 pp. M. 3.60.

PORTUGUESE.

Vasconcellos, J. Leite de.—Textos Archaicos para uso da aula de philologia portuguesa estabelecida na Bibliotheca Nacional de Lisboa por portaria de dezembro de 1903, coordenados, anotados e providos de um glossario. 2ª edição (ampliada). *Lisboa*: Livraria classica editora de A. M. Teixeira & Cia., 1908. 8vo., 160 pp.

FRENCH.

Appel, Carl.—Gui von Cambrai, Balaham und Josaphas, nach den Handschriften von Paris und Monte Cassino herausgegeben von —. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1907. 8vo., lxxxii and 467 pp.

Baudier.—Sully Prudhomme's philosophische Anschauungen. 8vo., 30 pp. Program. Ohligs-Wald, 1908.

Bédier, Joseph.—Les légendes épiques: Recherches sur la formation des chansons de geste. *Paris*: H. Champion, 1908. 8vo., 443 pp.

Chatelain, Henri.—Le Mystère de Saint Quentin, suivi des Invençons du corps de Saint Quentin par Eusèbe et par Eloi. Édition critique publiée avec introduction et glossaire. *Saint Quentin*: Imprimerie Générale, 1908. 4to., xvi and 56 pp.

Delplanque, A.—Fénelon et la Doctrine l'amour pur d'après sa correspondance avec ses principaux amis. *Lille*: librairie Giard, 1907. 8vo., 101 pp. (Mémoires et Travaux des Facultés catholiques de Lille, fasc. 5.)

Ecorcheville, J.—Cornille et la musique. *Paris*: Imprimerie Fortin, 1906. 8vo., 24 pp. and plates.

Farrer, Lucy E.—Un Devancier de Cotgrave: La vie et les œuvres de Claude de Sainliens alias Claudius Holyband. *Paris*: H. Champion, 1908. 8vo., vii and 115 pp.

Feilinger, F.—Das Kind in der altfranzösischen Literatur. *Göttingen*: Vandenhoeck et Ruprecht, 1908. 8vo., 258 pp.

Friedrich, Dr. Ernst.—Die Magie im Französischen Theater des xvi. und xvii. Jahrhunderts. *Leipzig*: A. Deichert, 1908. 8vo., xxxvii and 343 pp. (Beiträge zur Romanischen und Englischen Philologie, xli.)

Mathews, Charles Eugley.—Cist and Cil: A Syntactical Study. *Baltimore*: J. H. Furst Company, 1907. 8vo., x and 119 pp. Johns Hopkins Dissertation, 1908.

Pellissier, Georges.—Voltaire philosophe. *Paris*: Armand Colin, 1908. 8vo., 305 pp.

Schneegans, Ed.—Maistre Pierre Pathelin, Farce du xve siècle, p. p. —. *Strasbourg*: Heitz, 1908. 8vo., 102 pp. (Bibliotheca Romanica 60-61.)

Snavey, Guy Everett.—The Æsopic Fables in the Mireoir Historial of Jehan de Vignay, edited with Introduction, Notes and Bibliography. *Baltimore*: J. H. Furst Company, 1908. 8vo., 47 pp. with facsimile. Johns Hopkins Dissertation, 1908.

Soubies, Albert.—Almanach des Spectacles. Année 1907. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1908. 8vo., 156 pp. Tome xxxvii de la nouvelle collection. Une eau-forte par Lalange et Jannin.

Stowell, William Averill.—Old-French Titles of Respect in Direct Address. *Baltimore*: J. H. Furst Company, 1908. 8vo., xiv and 239 pp. Johns Hopkins Dissertation, 1908.

Tuetey, Alexandre.—Archives Nationales: Inventaire analytique des Livres de couleur et Bannières du Chatelet, par —. Fascicule i-ii. *Paris*: Imprimerie Nationale, 1899-1907. 4to., xxxiv and 295 pp.

PROVENÇAL.

Beck, J. B.—Die Melodien der Troubadours, nach dem gesamten handschriftlichen Material zum erstenmal bearbeitet und herausgegeben von —. *Strassburg*: Karl J. Trübner, 1908. 4to., viii and 201 pp.

Fabre, C.—Le Troubadour Pons de Chaptueil: Quelques remarques sur sa vie et sur l'esprit de ses Poèmes. *Le Puy*: imprimerie Peyriller, Rouchon et Gamon, 1908. 8vo., 29 pp.

Hasberli, L.—Die Entwicklung der lateinischen Gruppen *kl, gl, pl, bl, fl* im Franko-Provenzalischen. 8vo., 31 pp. Bern Diss.

Nickel, Wilhelm.—Sirventes und Spruchdichtung. *Berlin*: Mayer und Müller, 1907. 8vo., 124 pp. (Palaestra LXIII.)

Roumanille, J.—Li Conte provençau e li Cascareto, avec bon nombre de ces contes traduits en français. Nouvelle édition. *Avignon*: librairie J. Roumanille, 1908. 16mo., 360 pp.

Schroetter, Willibald.—Ovid und die Troubadours. *Halle*: M. Niemeyer, 1908.

PEDAGOGICAL.

Budde, Gerhard.—Der Kampf um die fremdsprachliche Methodik. *Hannover*: Hahn, 1908. 8vo., v and 120 pp.

Carlton, Frank Tracy.—Education and Industrial Evolution. *New York*: The Macmillan Company, 1908. 12mo., xiv and 320 pp. (The Citizen's Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology.)

Eulenburg, Franz.—Der "akademische Nachwuchs": Eine Untersuchung über die Lage und die Aufgaben der Extraordinarien und Privatdozenten. *Leipzig*: B. G. Teubner, 1908. 8vo., x and 156 pp.

Lederer, Max.—Die Gestalt des Naturkinds im achtzehnten Jahrhundert. 8vo., 53 pp. Program Bielitz.

Michel, Hermann.—Petrus Mosellanus, Pädologia, herausgegeben von —. *Berlin*: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1906. 8vo., liv and 54 pp.

Paquier, J.-B.—L'Enseignement professionnel en France: Son histoire, ses différentes formes, ses résultats. *Paris*: Armand Colin, 5 Rue de Mézières, 1908. 18mo.

Walter, Max.—Zur Methodik des neusprachlichen Unterrichts. *Munich*: N. G. Elwert's Verlag, 1908.

GENERAL.

Fraenkel, L.—Adolf Ebert, der Literaturhistoriker. 8vo., 36 pp. Program München.

Maier, Heinrich.—Psychologie des emotionalen Denkens. *Tübingen*: I. C. B. Mohr, 1908. 8vo., xxvi and 826 pp.

Marty, Anton.—Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung der allgemeinen Grammatik und Sprachphilosophie. I. Band. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1908. 8vo., xxxii and 764 pp.

Möller, G. H.—Beiträge zur dramatischen Cleopatra-Literatur. Progr. Schweinfurt, 1908. 8vo., 39 pp.

Täuber, C.—Ortsnamen und Sprachwissenschaft; Ursprache und Begriffsentwicklung. *Zürich*: Art. Institut Orell Füssli, 1908. 8vo., 250 pp.

Teuber, V.—Die mittelalterlichen Gedichte von der Judith in ihrem Verhältnis zu einander untersucht. Progr. Komotau, 1908. 8vo., 19 pp.

Roberts, A. E., and A. Barter.—The Teaching of English. London: Blackie.

Rösener, F.—Die französischen Lehnwörter im Frühneueuglichen. Diss. Marburg: 1907.

Schuller, Otto.—Lautlehre von Ælfric's 'Lives of Saints.' Bonn: Carl Georgi, 1908.

Shakespeare.—The 'First Folio' Shakespeare: *The Taming of the Shrew; Coriolanus; The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Three vols. Edited, with notes, introduction, glossary, lists of variorum readings, and selected criticism, by Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1908.

Shepherd, Henry E.—A Commentary on Tennyson's In Memoriam. New York and Washington: The Neale Pub. Co., 1908.

Simpson, S. G.—Thomas Edward Brown, Le Poète de l'Île de Man. Diss. Université de Lille, 1908.

Smith, A. H.—Les Événements Politiques de France dans le Théâtre Anglais du Siècle d'Elisabeth. Diss. Paris: Émile Larose, 1908.

Spingarn, J. E.—Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. Volume I, 1605-1650; Vol. II, 1650-1685. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Thamm, W.—Das Relativpronomen in der Bibelübersetzung Wyclifs und Purveys. Diss. Berlin: 1908.

Thomson, J. C.—Bibliography of the Writings of Charles and Mary Lamb. Hull: J. R. Tulin, 1908.

Thorndike, Ashley H.—Tragedy. [The Types of English Literature.] Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1908.

Ullrich, A.—Ueber das Verhältnis von Wace's Roman de Brut zu seiner Quelle, der Historia regum Britannie des Gottfried von Monmouth. Diss. Leipzig: 1908.

Upsham, Alfred Horatio.—The French Influence in English Literature, from the accession of Elizabeth to the Restoration. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908.

Von der Warth, Josef.—Metrisch-Sprachliches und Textkritisches zu Cynewulfs Werken. Halle: E. Karras, 1908.

Werner, R. M.—Der Einfluss der deutschen Litteratur auf W. M. Thackeray. Program: Teplitz-Schönan, 1907.

Winther, F.—Carlyle's litterarische Kritik und deren erzieherische Tendenz. Program. Freiburg: 1907.

Zeitlin, Jacob.—The Accusative with Infinitive and some kindred constructions in English. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908.

Zippel, Otto.—Thompson's Seasons. Critical edition, being a reproduction of the original texts, with all the various readings of the later editions, historically arranged. [Palæstra LXVI.] Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1908.

ITALIAN.

Agostini, Costanza.—Il Racconto del Boccaccio e i Primi Sette Canti della Commedia. Torino: Paravia, 1908. 8vo., 82 pp., L. 2.

Bartolommeo del Bene.—Odi xxviii di B. d. B. Gentiluomo Fiorentino, edite da Giosuè Carducci e Severino Ferrari. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1908. 8vo., L. 5.

Biagi, Vincenzo.—La Quaestio de Aqua et Terra di Dante: bibliografia, dissertazione critica sull'autenticità, testo e commento, lessigrafia. Modena: Vincenzi, 1908. 4o, 195 pp., con 4 tavole.

Boccaccio.—Il Decamerone: Terza Giornata. Biblioteca Romanica, nn. 48, 49. Strassburg: Heitz u. Muendel, 1908.

Carducci.—Opere, vol. xviii. Archeologia Poetica. Contiene: Della Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie o Rare—Della lirica popolare italiana dei sec. xiii e xiv—Di alcune poesie popolari bolognesi del sec. xiii inedite—Intorno ad alcune rime dei sec. xiii e xiv ritrovate nei memoriali di Bologna—Di Matteo Frescobaldi e delle sue rime—Prefazione alle rime di F. Petrarca sopra argomenti storici, morali e diversi—Discorso su la canzone "spirto gentil"—Discorso su la canzone "Quel ch'ha nostra natura"—Discorso sulla canzone "Italia mia." Bologna: Zanichelli, 1908. 8vo., 451 pp., L. 4.

Crescini, Vincenzo.—Il Canto xxviii dell' Inferno, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele a Firenze. Firenze: Sansoni, 1908. 8vo., 62 pp., L. 1.

D'Azeglio, Massimo.—I Mieì Ricordi. Firenze: Barbèra, 1908. 16°, xv and 548 pp., L. 2.50 (con ritratto).

De Amicis, Edmondo.—Nel Regno dell' Amore, I. (L'ora divina—Fiore del passato—Il numero ventitre—La quercia e il fiore). Milano: Treves, 1908. 8vo., fig., 99 pp., L. 1.

Del Lungo, Isidoro.—Il Canto vi dell' Inferno, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. Firenze: Sansoni, 1908. 8vo., 43 pp., L. 1.

D'Ovidio, Francesco.—Nuovi Studi Manzoniiani:—Ermengarda—L'Innominato e Lucia—Il ritorno dei Manzoni alla fede cattolica—L'epistolario del M.—Per il senatore A. M.—Il Cinque Maggio in Spagna—Un libro che tutti conoscono e che nessuno legge—Qualche inavvertenza nei Promessi Sposi vera o apparente—I brani inediti—Il determinismo nell' arte e nella critica—L'arte per l'arte. Milano: Hoepli, 1908. 16°, xii and 683 pp., L. 6.50.

Fromaigeat, E.—Die Komische Elemente in Ariostos Orlando Furioso. Berner Diss. Winterthur: Ziegler, 1908. 8vo., 115 pp.

Guerrini, Olindo.—Brani di Vita. Bologna: Zanichelli: 1908. 16°, 663 pp., L. 6, con ritratto e facsimile.

Magrini, Diana.—Le Epistole Metriche di Francesco Petrarca. Rocca S. Casciano: Cappelli, 1908. 8°, 206 pp., L. 2.50. (Coll. d. indagini ecc. dir. d. G. Mazzoni, vol. xii.)

Mantovani, Dino.—Il Canto xxxii dell' Inferno, letto nella sala di Dante in Orsanmichele a Firenze. Firenze: Sansoni, 1908. 8°, 39 pp., L. 1.

Petrarca, Francesco.—Il Canzoniere, secondo l'autografo, con le note di Giuseppe Rigutini rifuse e accresciute per le persone colte e per le scuole da M. Scherillo. 2ª ediz. interamente rinnovata. Milano: Hoepli, 1908. 16°, xcii and 474 pp., L. 2.50.

— I Trionfi. Biblioteca Romanica, no. 47. Strassburg: Heitz und Muendel, 1908. 76 pp.

Simonatti, Mario.—L'Ode alla Regina di Giosuè Carducci: studio storico-estetico seguito da un saggio di bibliografia carducciana. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1908. 16°, L. 2.

Toynbee, Paget.—Dante Alighieri. Tradotto dall' Inglese, con appendice bibliografica di Gustavo Balsamo-Crivelli. Torino: Bocca, 1908. 16°, 263 pp., L. 3.

SPANISH.

Avellaneda, G. Gómez de.—Baltasar, a Biblical drama, in four acts and in verse. Edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary by Carlos Bransby. New York: American Book Company, 1908. 12mo., 224 pp.

Castillo Solórzano, A. de.—Tardes entretenidas, en seis novelas, publicadas por D. Emilio Cotarelo y Mori. (Antiguas Novelas Españolas, tomo ix.) Madrid: Imp. Ibérica, 1908. 8vo., 405 pp., 3 pes.

Cervantes.—Selections from Don Quijote. Edited with notes and vocabulary by J. D. M. Ford. Boston: Heath & Co., 1908. 12mo., x and 198 pp.

Eario, R.—Parisiense. Madrid: Domingo Blanco, [1907]. 8vo.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J.—Chapters on Spanish Literature. London: Constable and Company, 1908. 8vo., xi + 260 pp.

— The Nun Ensign, translated from the Spanish with an introduction and notes. Also, *La Monja Alférez*, a play in the original Spanish by Juan Pérez de Montalbán. London: Fisher Unwin, 1908. 8vo., x + 304 pp.

García Gutiérrez, A.—El Trovador. Edited with notes and vocabulary by H. H. Vaughan. Boston: Heath & Co., 1908.

Johnson, A. B.—Cuentos Modernos, edited with introduction, notes and vocabulary. New York: American Book Company, 1908. 12mo., 252 pp.

Libro de los Gatos, a text with introduction and notes by G. T. Northup. (University of Chicago Dissertation.) Chicago: 1908. 8vo., 78 pp.

Mérimée, E.—Précis de l'histoire de la littérature espagnole. Paris: Garnier, 1908. 12mo.

Palacio Valdes, A.—Semblanzas literarias; Los oradores del Ateneo; Los novelistas españoles; Nuevo viaje al Parnaso. (Obras completas, tomo xi.) Madrid: M. G. Hernández, 1908. 8vo., 418 pp., 4 pes.

Pérez, Galdós, B.—Episodios Nacionales. Cuarto Série. Los tormentos del 48. Madrid: Hernando, 1908. 8vo., 309 pp., 3 pes.

— España sin Rey. (Episodios Nacionales. Serie final.) Madrid: Sucesores de Hernando, 1908. 8vo., 339 pp.

